



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. 0:2JC4m73:N24 H 3

Ac. No. 300640

Date of release for loan

6 MAY 1970

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.

NOT TO BE TOUCHED

THE
SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION
BULLETIN

VOLUME 18, 1943

Reprinted 1963
By Permission
Of The Original Publisher

AMS REPRINT COMPANY
New York 3, N. Y.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVIII

1943

C O N T E N T S

300640

PAGE

Shakspere and His Contemporaries in the literature of 1942	
A classified bibliography	S. A. Tannenbaum 2
Index of Names and Subjects in the 1942 Bibliography	Ralph P. Rosenberg 15
Imagery of Fire in the <i>Faerie Queene</i>	Grace W. Landrum 22
A Mirror of National Integration	Henry W. Wells 30
Spenser's Wrenock	Louis S. Friedland 41
'And Curst Be He'	Robert Withington 48
Humanism in Shakspere's Works	Prof. M. M. Morozov 51
Teaching the Shaksperian Drama	Clyde F. Lytle 62
Shakspere's Stage Business	Samuel A. Small 66
Magic—Of An Age and For All Time	Claire McGlinchee 72
Shakspere And Sir Thomas Moore	Paul Deutschberger 75
Much Ado About Something	George C. Taylor 92
Editorial Comment—An Important New Book .	S. A. T. 95

C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
The <i>Sir Thomas Moore</i> Problem Reconsidered	<i>Paul Deutschberger</i> 99
George Bancroft's View of Shakspere	<i>Russel B. Nye</i> 109
'Nature and Art' in <i>Winter's Tale</i>	<i>Harold S. Wilson</i> 114
Shakspere's Heroic Shrew	<i>Raymond A. Houk</i> 121
Removing a Scar From <i>All's Well</i>	<i>Samuel A. Tannenbaum</i> 133
Sorrow and Love on the Elizabethan Stage	<i>Lawrence Babb</i> 137
Editorial Comment—John Donne and Bibliography	<i>S.A.T.</i> 143
The <i>Sir Thomas Moore</i> Problem Reconsidered	<i>Paul Deutschberger</i> 156
Satire Concerning the Ale and Wine Trades	<i>Burton Milligan</i> 147
Jaques' Seven Ages	<i>Josephine W. Bennett</i> 168
Shakspere's Heroic Shrew	<i>Raymond A. Houk</i> 175
Polonius's Advice to Laertes	<i>N. B. Allen</i> 187
Editorial Comment—Was Shakspere a Botcher?	<i>S.A.T.</i> 191

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary
Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

SHAKSPERE AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

(A Classified Bibliography for 1942)

Compiled by
SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

The following bibliography, based on an examination of the contents of more than 1,400 periodicals and hundreds of books in the N. Y. Public Library and in the library of Columbia University, is a continuation of those published in the January issues of this Bulletin for some years past. Only those items have been listed which I thought contributed a new idea or a new fact. The names of female writers, if known, are distinguished by a colon after the initial letter of the baptismal name. The titles of books and pamphlets are printed in italics. If no year of publication is mentioned in connection with an item, 1942 is to be understood. The discussion of a book, as opposed to an edition, is indicated by printing the title within single quotes and omitting 'ed' after the contributor's name. The following abbreviations have been employed:

Amer	—American	M	—Magazine
Archiv	—Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen	MLN	—Modern Language Notes
B	—Bulletin	MLQ	—Modern Language Quarterly
Bei	—Beiblatt zur Anglia	MLR	—Modern Language Review
bib	—bibliography	MP	—Modern Philology
Bll	—Blätter	NQ	—Notes & Queries
Bn	—Boston	OUP	—Oxford University Press
comp	—compiler	Oxf	—Oxford
CUP	—Cambridge University Press	P	—Press
d	—der, die, das, dem, &c.	PL	—Poet Lore
DNS	—Die neueren Sprachen	PMLA	—Publications of the Modern Language Ass'n of America
dt	—deutsch, &c.	port(s)	—portrait(s)
ed(d)	—editor(s)	p p	—privately printed
ELH	—Journal of English Literary History	PQ	—Philological Quarterly
Elizn	—Elizabethan	Pr	—Proceedings
Engl	—English, englische, &c.	Q	—Quarterly
ES	—Englische Studien	R	—Review, Revue
fac(s)	—facsimile(s)	Repr	—Reprinted, reprints
fr	—from	RES	—Review of English Studies
GR	—Germanic Review	SAB	—Shakespeare Ass'n Bulletin
Hist	—History, Historie, Histoire	Sh	—Shakespeare, Shakspere, &c
HLQ	—Huntington Library Quarterly	Shn	—Shaksperian
il(s)	—illustration(s)	SJ	—Shakespeare Jahrbuch
J	—Journal	SP	—Studies in Philology
JEGP	—Journal of English & Germanic Philology	Sp	—Spectator
Lang	—Language	TAM	—Theatre Arts Monthly
Libr	—Library	TLS	—Times Literary Supplement
Lit	—Literature	trn	—translation
Ln	—London	u	—und
		U	—University
		UP	—University Press

That I am sincerely grateful to all who have helped me in the preparation of this bibliography goes without saying.

ABSTRACTS

1. *Tales from Sh.*—C. & M: Lamb.—N. Y.: T. Crowell Co., \$2. (With ils by E: Blaistell.)
2. C. Lamb's revision of the *Tales*.—J. H. Birss.—Amer Notes & Queries, 2: 83-84, Sept.

AMERICA

3. Notes on *Sh & America*.—M. E. Smith.—SAB, 17: 61-62, Jan.
4. Sh's place in W. Whitman's America.—R. P. Falk.—SAB, 17: 86-96, Apr.

ANTHOLOGIES

5. *The Golden Hind: An Anthology of Elizn Prose & Poetry*.—R. Lamson & H. Smith, edd.—N. Y.: W. W. Norton & Co., pp. xviii + 846, front, 3 maps, music, & genealogical table, \$6.

ASTROLOGY

6. *The Star-Grossed Renaissance*.—D. C. Allen.—Durham UP, 1941, pp. xii + 280, \$3.

AUTHORSHIP PROBLEMS

7. Shn puzzles.—P. C. Ray.—Calcutta R, 78: 1-7 (Jan. 1941), 87-92 (Feb.), 207-13 (Mar.), 79: 1-5 (Apr.).

AUTOGRAPHS

8. Sh's legal documents.—J. H. Wigmore.—Amer. Bar Ass'n J, 28: 134, Feb.

BACON, FRANCIS

9. F. B. on Platonism.—F. H. Anderson.—U of Toronto Q, 11: 154-66, Jan.
10. King James on F. B.—N. E. McClure.—TLS, Jan. 17, p. 31.
11. Observations on a letter of advice fr F. B. to Essex.—F. H. Arnold.—Baconiana, 26: 67-72, Apr.
12. F. B.'s connection with the emblem lit of the 16th & 17th centuries.—L. Bid-

dulph.—Baconiana, 26: 78-82 (Apr.), 145-50 (July), ils & facss.

13. F. B. & the Catholics.—A. G. Hardman.—Baconiana, 26: 172-74, July.
14. Lord Bacon was a poet.—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 179-86, Oct.
15. Lord Bacon edns.—R. W. Gibson.—TLS, May 30 (p. 271), June 20 (p. 312).

BACON-SH QUESTION

17. Bacon-Sh & *Proverbs xxix*.—Baconiana, 26: 17-31, Jan.
18. *The Secret Sh.*—A. Dodd.—Ln, 194.—(See *Baconiana*, Apr., 26: 104-06.)
19. *No Bed for Bacon*.—C. Brahms & S. J. Simon.—Ln, 194—, 8s.
20. Should Sh be exhumed?—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 49-52, Apr., 3 ils.
21. Bacon, Sh, & T. Nashe.—W. S. Melsome.—Baconiana, 26: 53-66 (Apr.), 122-37 (July).
22. Could Bacon have found time?—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 83-87, Apr.
23. Only an actor could have written the plays.—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 88-92, Apr.
24. A conceit somewhat ridiculous.—A. A. Leith.—Baconiana, 26: 73-77, Apr.
25. Bacon or Sh does it matter?—H. S. Bridgewater.—Baconiana, 26: 1-10, Jan.
26. Could Bacon have committed the 'errors' in the plays?—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 109-13, July.
27. Who wrote the 'Sh' plays?—K. Murchison.—Baconiana, 26: 138-44, July.
28. Facts that fit.—H. K. Baker.—Baconiana, 26: 151-57 (July), 204-09 (Oct.).
29. The testimony of Mrs. Judith [!] Hall.—E. D. Johnson.—Baconiana, 26: 158-60, July.
30. *The Man in the Sh Mask*.—J. S. L. Millar.—Edinb, pp. 16, 6d.
31. The wisdom of Sh.—M. Sennett.—Baconiana, 26: 187-95, Oct.
32. Constant & inconstant love.—W. S. Melsome.—Baconiana, 26: 196-203, Oct.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

33. Annual bibliography of *Elizabethiana* published in 1941.—S. A. Tannenbaum.—SAB, 17: 2-17, Jan.

34. Index to bibliography of *Elizabethiana* published in 1941.—R. P. Rosenberg.—SAB, 17: 18-24, Jan.

35. F. Bateson's *Cambr Bibliography of Engl Lit.*—D. F. Bond.—MP, 39: 303-12, Feb.

36. D. P. Kingsley's Sh collection.—TLS, Jan 3, p. 12.

37. *The Year's Work in Engl Studies* (Vol. xx)—F. S. Boas, ed.—Oxford UP, \$3.75.

38. The 1st 3 Boston edns of Sh's poems.—M. W. S. Swan.—Papers of the Bibliographical Soc. of America, 36: 27-36.

39. What is bibliography?—TLS, July 18, p. 355.

BIOGRAPHY

40. B. R. Lewis's *Sb Documents*.—T. W. Baldwin.—MLN, 57: 364-73, May.—TLS, Aug. 22, p. 420.

41. A portrait of Anne Hathaway?—S.A.T.—SAB, 17: 112, Apr.

42. The license for Sh's marriage.—J. G. McManaway.—MLN, 57: 450-51, June.

43. H. Pearson's *A Life of Wm. Sh.*—R. L. Eagle.—Baconiana, 26: 161-65, July.

44. Sh's will a forgery.—Baconiana, 26: 212-13 & 217, Oct.

BOOK TITLES (1942)

45. *The Wind & the Rain*.—C. Grayson & J. Eldredge.—TN, v, i, 399.

46. *Instruct My Sorrows*.—C. Jaynes.—KJ, III, i, 68.

47. *This Great Argument* (1941).—M. Kelley.—TN, III, ii, 12.

48. *The Moon Is Down*.—J. Steinbeck.—M, II, i, 2.

49. *Lay On, Macduff*.—C. Armstrong.—M, V, viii, 33.

50. *Sound and Fury*.—F. Chase.—M, V, v, 27.

51. *And Let the Coffin Pass*.—K. Abbey.—R3, I, ii, 38.

52. *When Next We Meet*.—R. Lambert. R & J, II, ii, 122.

53. *The Edge of the Sword*.—V. Pozner.—M, IV, i, 151.

54. *The Strings, My Lord, Are False*.—P. V. Carroll.—JC, IV, iii, 292.

55. *A Deed Without a Name*.—E. Phillips.—M, IV, i, 49.

56. *Passing Strange*.—R. Sale.—O, I, iii, 160.

57. *Heavenly Harmony*.—H. & S. Lieferant.—TS, III, i, 5.

58. *This Fortress*.—M. Coles.—R2, II, i, 43.

59. *Motley's the Only Wear*.—T. H. McNeal.—AYLI, II, vii, 34.

60. *Thankless Child*.—F. Swinnerton.—KL, I, iv, 311.

61. *If We Should Fail*.—M. White.—M, I, vii, 59.

BRETON, NICHOLAS

62. N. B.'s *The Hate of Treason*.—J. Robertson.—MLN, 57: 116-19, Feb.

CHAPMAN, GEORGE

63. *The Poems of G. C.*.—P. B. Bartlett ed.—N. Y. 1941, pp. viii + 488.

64. Nature & the tragic hero in G. C.'s *Bussy* plays.—R. H. Perkinson.—Modern Language Q, 3: 263-85, June.

65. Stylistic devices in G. C.'s *Illiads*.—P. B. Bartlett.—PMLA, 57: 661-75, Sept.

66. Some notes on G. C.'s poems.—G. G. Loane.—NQ, 183: 272-76 (Nov. 7), 332-33 (Dec. 5).

67. P. B. Bartlett's edn of G. C.'s *Poems*.—[G. G. Loane].—NQ, 183: 300, Nov. 7.

68. The poems of G. C.—TLS, Oct. 3, p. 486.

69. Some additional poems by G. C.—J. Robertson—Libr, 22: 168-76, Sept. 1941.

83. *The Nature of Literature: Its Relation to Science & Human Experience*.—T. C. Pollock.—Princeton UP, pp. xxiv + 218, \$3.

COMMEDIA DELL' ARTE

70. Some pictorial aspects of early *commedia-dell'arte* acting.—J. H. McDowell—SP, 39: 47-64, Jan.

COMMENTARY

71. *Sh Without Tears*.—M. Webster.—N. Y. Whittlesey House, pp. xii + 320, \$2.75.—J. Corbin, N. Y. Times Book R, Feb. 1, p. 8.

72. *The Oration in Sh*.—M. B. Kennedy.—Chapel Hill: U of N. C. Press, pp. x + 270, \$3.

73. Ueber d. Historiendrama in d. engl. Renaissance.—W. F. Schirmer.—Archiv, 179: 1-7, Apr. 1941.

74. A. Thalcr's *Sh & Democracy*.—A. Harbage.—MLN, 57: 376-78, May.

75. Fear of the people as a minor motive in Sh.—J. C. McCloskey.—SAB, 17: 67-72, Apr.

76. Sh's development as a dramatist in the light of his experience.—H. Craig.—SP, 39: 226-40, Apr.

77. The Arctic voyages of Wm. Barents in probable relation to certain of Sh's plays.—S. M. Nutt.—SP, 39: 241-64, Apr. 4 ills.

78. *Laterality dominance in Sh's plays*.—G. Walsh & R. M. Pool.—Charlotte, N.C., pp. 8. (Repr fr *Southern Medicine & Surgery*, vol. 104, Feb.)

79. Jacobi's *Form u Struktur der Sh'schen Komodien* (1937).—E. Deckner.—Bei, 52: 58-60, Mar. 1941.

80. Sh & some conventions of old age.—E. H. Cox.—SP, 39: 36-46, Jan.

81. Appearance & reality in Sh's last plays.—T. Spencer.—MP, 39: 265-74, Feb.

82. Sh & the speaking line.—L. W. Smith.—PL, 48: 61-70, Apr.

83. *The Nature of Literature: Its Relation to Science & Human Experience*.—T. C. Pollock.—Princeton UP, pp. xxiv + 218, \$3.

84. The criticism of Sh's last plays: a caveat.—F. R. Leavis.—Scrutiny, 10: 339-45, Apr.

85. M. Arnold on Sh.—W. Jaggard, et al.—NQ, 182: 276 (May 16), 348 (June 20); 183: 52 (July 18).

86. Heroes & villains. Sh, Middleton, Byron, Dickens.—E. E. Stoll.—RES, 18: 257-69, July.

87. Stoll's *Sh & Other Masters*.—H. S. Bennett.—RES, 18: 344-45, July.

88. *Sh & the Nature of Man*.—T. Spencer.—N. Y. Macmillan, pp. xvi + 234, \$2.75.

89. The fencing actor-lines in Sh's plays.—J. L. Jackson.—MLN, 57: 615-21, Dec.

90. Campbell's *Comical Satire*.—U. Ellis-Fermor.—MLR, 37: 498-500, Oct.

CONTEMPORARIES

91. The early Stuarts.—HLQ, 5: 192-201, Jan.

92. *The Life of F. Drake*.—A. E. W. Mason N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co., pp. x + 350, \$3.75.—F. P. Wilson, N. Y. Times Book R, Apr. 26, p. 5.

93. A biographical dictionary of Elizn authors.—M. Eccles.—HLQ, 5: 281-302, Apr.

94. A bogus envoy fr James I.—S. T. Bindoff.—History, 27: 15-37, June.

95. Drake & Burghley.—Mariner's Mirror, 28: 317-18, Oct.

CONTEMPORARY DRAMA

96. Notes on early Stuart stage history.—C. J. Sisson.—MLR, 37: 25-36, Jan.

97. G. Bentley's *Jacobean & Caroline Stage*.—C. J. Sisson.—MLR, 37: 88-91, Jan.

98. R. R. Cawley's *Unpashed Waters*.—E. G. Cox.—Modern Language Q, 3: 123-25, Mar.

99. *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*. [With *The Life & Death of the Merry Devil*. intr & notes.]—W. A. Abrams, ed.—Duke UP, pp. x + 290, bib, \$3.50.

100. The development of the stage Irishman to 1800.—J. O. Bartley.—MLR, 37: 438-48, Oct.

CONTEMPORARY POETRY

101. The transition in poetry.—H. H. Hudson.—HLQ, 5: 188-90, Jan.

102. Music in poetry.—N. Frye.—U of Toronto Q, 11: 166-79, Jan.

103. B. Barnes's use of G. Fenton's *Hist of Guicciardini*.—J. Fellheimer.—MLN, 57: 358-59, May.

104. The quarrel of the satirists.—A. Davenport.—MLR, 37: 123-30, Apr.

105. Some pre-Armada propaganda poetry in England, 1585-86.—T. Brooke, tr & ed.—Pr of the Amer Philosophical Soc., 85: 71-83, Nov.

CONTEMPORARY PROSE

106. *The Elizn Prelude*.—I. C. Story.—Forest Grove: Pacific U.

DANIEL, SAMUEL

107. *S. D.: A Concise Bibliography*. (With a Foreword.)—S. A. Tannenbaum.—N. Y.: The Author (601 W. 113th St.), pp. x + 38, \$3.75.

DAVENANT, WILLIAM

108. W. D., father of Engl scenery.—R. Southern.—Life & Letters Today, 32: 114-26, Feb.

DONNE, JOHN

109. *Complete Poems of J. D.*.—R. E. Bennett, ed.—Chicago, pp. xxx + 306, 95c.—D. C. Allen, JEGP, 41: 548-49, Oct.

110. J. D. & the couplet.—A. Stein.—PMLA, 57: 676-96, Sept.

111. The dynamic image in metaphysical

poetry.—A: S. Brandenburg.—PMLA, 57: 1039-45, Dec.

112. *J. D. since 1900: A Bibliography of Periodical Articles*.—W. White.—Boston: F. W. Faxon Co., pp. vi + 23, Repr fr B of Bibliography.)

113. A J. D. ms. in St. Paul's cathedral.—E: M. Simpson.—PQ, 21: 237-39, Apr.

114. The grounds of religious toleration in the thoughts of J. D.—R. W. Battenhouse.—Church History, 11: 217-48, Sept.

115. J D & Virginia in 1610.—H. Cooper.—MLN, 57: 661-63, Dec.

116. J. D. the lawyer.—TLS, Aug. 1, p. 379.

117. J. D.'s alchemical figures.—E. H. Duncan.—ELH, 9: 257-65, Dec.

DRAMA

119. *How to Write a Play*.—L. Egri.—N. Y., pp. xviii + 304.

120. Langenbeck's *Wiedergeburt d Dramas* (1940).—A. v. Blumenthal.—Bei, 32: 56-58, Mar. 1941.

DRAYTON, MICHAEL

121. Tillotson's *M. D. & His Circle*, &c.—O. Elton.—RES, 118: 111-15, Jan.

EDUCATION & CULTURE

122. Problems in the cultural hist of Tudor England.—HLQ, 5: 176-83, Jan.

123. A survey of Elizn reading.—M. Eccles.—HLQ, 5: 180-82, Jan.

ELIZABETH, QUEEN

124. Attempt to murder Q. E.—W. Jaggard; M. H. Dodds.—NQ, 183: 17 (July 4), 117 (Aug. 15).

125. *Q. E: Creature of Circumstance*.—H. Belloc.—N. Y.: Harper, pp. x + 258, 9 pll, \$3.—H. Gorman, Times Book R, Oct. 25, p. 36.—M. Rugoff; N. Y. Herald Tribune Books, Aug. 23, p. 10.

ENVIRONMENT

126. The social diffusion of ideas in the Engl Renaissance.—HLQ, 5: 169-75, Jan.

127. *The Truth of Our Times* by H. Peacham. [Facs, With intr.]—R. R. Cawley ed.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. xxiv + [xii] + 204, \$2.

128. Elizn manners & Morals.—Baconiana, 25: 11-16, Jan.

129. *The English Yeoman under Elizabeth & the Early Stuarts*.—M: Campbell.—New Haven: Yale UP, \$3.75.

130. Ways & means in Elizn propaganda.—G Jenkins.—History, 26: 105-14, Sept.

ERASMUS, D.

131. D. E. & propaganda.—M: M. Phillips.—MLR, 37: 1-17, Jan.

132. D. E.—E. L. Tinker.—N Y. Times Book R, Aug. 30, p. 22.

133. *The Praise of Folly*. [With essay & commentary by H. H. Hudson].—J. Wilson, tr.—Princeton UP, \$2.50.—J. A. Gee, JEGP, 41: 544-46, Oct.

134. *The Praise of Folly*. [With Life of D. E].—H. van Lorn, ed.—N Y. W. J. Black, 89c.

135. Lo hispánico y el Erasmismo.—A. Castro.—Revista de filología hispanica, 4: 1-66, Jan.

GASCOIGNE, GEORGE

136. G. G. & *The Noble Art of Venery*—J. Robertson.—MLR, 37: 484-85, Oct.

137. G. G. as a pioneer.—TLS, Sept. 19, pp. 462 & 464, post.

138. G. G.: *A Concise Bibliography*. [With a Foreword].—S. A. Tannenbaum.—The Author (N. Y., 601 W. 113th St.), pp. x + 22, \$3.

GREVILLE, FULKE

139. F. G.'s 'Caelica': *An Evaluation*.—W. Frost.—Brattleboro: Vermont Printing Co., pp. vi + 62, 4 facss, p p. \$1.

HARVEY, GABRIEL

140. The Harvey-Nashe controversy.—A. Davenport.—NQ, 182: 116-19, Feb. 28.

HERBERT, GEORGE

141. F. E. Hutchinson's edn of *G. H.*—H. J. C. Grierson—MLR, 37: 207-14, Apr.

HERRICK, R.

142. *Some Poems of R. H.*—Norfolk, Conn.

HEYWOOD, JOHN

143. 'John, Tyb, & Sir John'; *The Pardonner & the Friar*.—H. W. Wells & L. S. Loomis, edd.—*Representative Medieval & Tudor Plays*, pp. 245-98.

HUMOR

144. Humor.—C. Modae.—Calcutta R, 83: 153-62, May.

INFLUENCE

145. Tennyson's *Maud* & Sh.—T. P. Garrison, Jr.—SAB, 17: 80-85, Apr.

ITALY

146. Italy in Elizn pamphlets.—M. M. Bhattacherjee.—Calcutta R, 83: 129-35, May.

147. Un Maquiavelo sin maquiavelismo.—R. Arciniega.—Atenea, 69: 370-75, Sept.

148. Machiavelli & the spirit of comedy.—C. S. Singleton.—MLN, 57: 585-92, Nov.

JONSON, BEN

149. Unity of time in *Every Man In & in Cynthia's Revels*.—M. Kallrich.—MLN, 57: 445-49, June.

150. Vol. 7 of the new *B. J.*—C. J. Sisson.—MLR, 37: 203-05, Apr.

151. A. H. King's book on *The Poetaster*.—G. D. Willcock—MLR, 37: 205-07, Apr.

152. B. J. (Vol. 7: *The Sad Shepherd; Fall of Mortimer; Masques; Entertainments.*)—C. H. Herford, P. & E. Simpson, edd.—Oxford UP, \$10.

153. The alchemy of *Mercury Vindicated*.—E. H. Duncan—SP, 39: 625-37, Oct.

154. B. J.'s masques: a rejoinder.—E. M. Simpson.—RES, 18: 291-300, July.

155. B. J.'s lament for S. Pavy.—G. E. Bentley.—TLS, May 30, p. 276.

156. Influencias italianas en las comedias de B. J.—M. Berveiller.—Filosofia y letras, 3: 51-71 (Jan.), 193-211 (Apr.).

KYD, THOMAS

157. J. P. Collier & *The Murder of J. Brewen*.—R. M. Gorrell.—MLN, 57: 441-44, June.

158. T. K.—J. Bakeless.—*The Tragical Hist of C. Marlowe*, pp. 110-14, 176-80, 262-65, &c.

LANGUAGE

159. The creators of modern English.—H. Bayley.—Baconiana, 26: 32-42, Jan.

160. Sh's 'night-rule'.—H. Kokeritz—Language, 18: 40-44, Jan.

161. *Sh & the Dictson of Common Life*.—F. P. Wilson.—N. Y.: Oxf UP, 85c.

162. Analysis of imagery: a critique of literary method. L: H. Hornstein.—PMLA, 57: 638-53, Sept.

163. 'Bug' in Sh & his contemporaries.—J. G. M.—Amer Notes & Queries, 2: 24-26, May.

LAW

164. *The Law of Property in Sh & the Elizn Drama*.—P. S. Clarkson & C. T. Warren.—Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, pp. xxviii + 346, \$3.50.

LYLY, JOHN

165. *Oxford & Endymion*.—J. W. Bennett.—PMLA, 57: 354-69, June.

MARLOWE, C.

166. Some Nashe marginalia concerning C. M.—P. H. Kocher.—MLN, 57: 45-50, Jan.

167. *C. M's Tamburlaine: A Study in Renaissance Moral Philosophy*.—R. W. Battenhouse.—Vanderbilt UP (Nashville, Tenn.), pp. x + 266, front, \$2.50.

168. Part 2 of *Tamburleine*.—H. L. Gardner.—MLR, 37: 18-24, Jan.

169. F. S. Boas's new book on C. M.—M. Eccles—MLR, 37: 53-55, Jan.

170. T. Nashe's authorship of the prose scenes in *Faustus*.—P. H. Kocher.—Modern Language Q, 3: 17-40, Mar.

171. C. M's art of war.—P. H. Kocher.—SP, 39: 207-25, Apr.

172. Mephistophilis & the lost 'dragon'.—L. Kirschbaum.—RES, 18: 312-15, July.

173. *The Tragical Hist of C. M.*.—J. Bakeless.—Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2 vols, il & 7 facss, \$7.50.

174. Elizn literary phenomena.—Baconiana, 26: 114-21, July.

175. The theme of despair in *Dr. Faustus*.—J. C. McCloskey.—College Engl, 4: 110-13, Nov.

MARSTON, JOHN

176. The quarrel of the satirists.—A. Davenport—MLR, 37: 123-30, Apr.

177. J. M.—J. Bakeless.—*The Tragical Hist of C. Marlowe*, pp. 115-19.

MIDDLETON, THOMAS

178. Some notes on Crane's ms. of *The Witch*.—W. W. Greg.—Library, 22: 208-22, Mar.

179. T. M.—J. Bakeless.—*The Tragical Hist of C. Marlowe, passim*.

MISCELLANEA

180. R. W. Chambers's *Man's Unconquerable Mind*.—W. F. Bryan.—MLN, 57: 381-83, May.—L. C. Wrosh; Books, July 26, p. 18 VIII.

181. *The Folger Sh. Memorial Library* 1931-1941.—J. Q. Adams.—[Wash'n] 1942, pp. viii + 62, 3 ils.

182. *The Truth About Ann.* [A 3-act play.] —T. Lennon.—N. Y.: J. Day Co., pp. xii + 132, \$2.

183. *When Sh's Ladies Meet.* [A one-act comedy.]—C. George—N. Y.: Dramatists Play Service (6 E. 39th St.), 35c

184. Sh & Delacroix—A. Whitridge—SAB, 17: 167-83, Oct.

185. A Sh garden in Cleveland—S. A. Tannenbaum—SAB, 17: 208, Oct

186. Literary serendipity—L. Hotson—ELH, 9: 79-94, June.

MONOLOGUE

187. Der Monolog in Sh's Königsdramen [MS. diss., 1932]—A. Hinterwaldner—At the U of Vienna

188. Der Monolog in Sh's Tragodien [MS. diss., 1923]—R. Heller—At the U of Vienna.

189. Der Sh Monolog u s Spielweise.—E. Kilian.—Dramaturgische Bl (Munchen 1905), pp. 63-91

MONTAIGNE, M. DE

190. *Emerson's Montaigne*—C. L. Young N. Y., 1941, pp. xii + 236, bib

191. *M. de Mt. A Concise Bibliography.* —S. A. Tannenbaum, comp.—N. Y.: The author (N. Y., 601 W. 113th St.), pp. xii + 138, port, \$9.

192. How great was Sh's debt to Mt?—A. Harmon:—PMLA, 57: 988-1008, Dec.

MUSIC

193. Tudor popular music: its social significance.—C. M. Simpson.—HLQ, 5: 176-79, Jan.

194. *A Guide to Recorded Music.*—I. Kolodin, comp.—N. Y.: Doubleday 1941), pp. xvi + 496, \$3.

195. *Verdi the Man in his Letters.*—G.

Verdi (E. Downes, tr.)—N. Y.: L. B. Fischer, pp. 470, 8 ports, 5 ils.

196. *The Gramophone Shop Encyclopedia of Recorded Music.*—N. Y.: Simon & Schuster, \$3.95.

PEELE, GEORGE

197. G. P. & his friends as 'ghost'-poets—G. B. Parks—JEGP, 41: 527-36.

198. G. P.—J. Bakeless—*The Tragical Hist of C. Marlowe*, 1: 255-62, 2: 359-62, &c

PHILOSOPHY

199. Cosmic sense in Shn tragedy—W. J. Grace—Sewanee R, 50: 433-44, Oct

200. Sh & the Platonic tradition—F. A. Yates—U of Edinb J, 12: 2-12.

PLAYS & POEMS

Cymbeline (Cy)

201. The significance of *Cy*—A. A. Stephenson—Scrutiny, 10: 329-38, Apr.

Hamlet (H)

202. The exchange of rapiers—J. L. Jackson—MLN, 57: 50-55, Jan.

203. Questions to Gertrude [Sonnet.]—B. R. Sleeper—Sewanee R, 50: 77, Mar

204. Horatio's commentary.—J. G. Wales—SAB, 17: 40-56, Jan

205. Romantic apologists for Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia.—A. P. Hudson.—ELH, 9: 59-70, Mar. 1942.

206. Duthie's 'Bad' Quarto of 'H'.—H. Spencer.—MLN, 57: 223-25, Mar.

207. S. Bernhardt on Hamlet.—M. M. Shudofsky.—College English, 3: 293-95, Dec. 1941.

208. Die Kindertruppenstelle im *H.*—L. L. Schücking.—Archiv, 179: 8-14, Apr.

209. Oehlenschläger's Amleth.—N. L. Willey.—Scandinavian Studies, 17: 1-19, Feb.

210. Hamlet among the mechanists.—A. M. Sampley.—SAB, 17: 134-49, July.

211. 'H.'—M: Webster, S. Barr, & M. Van Doren.—*The New Invitation to Learning*, pp. 44-58.

212. *H* in China.—J. B. Atkinson—N. Y. Times, Dec. 18, pp. 1 & 38.

213. The play scene.—M. E. Prior.—ELH, 9: 188-97, Sept.

Henry IV (H4)

214. 'Alas, poor Yorick'—S. M. Pitcher.—PQ, 21: 239-40, Apr.

215. M. Shaaber's ed'n of 2H4.—H. T. Price; JEGP, 41: 97-99, Jan.—M: Doran; MLN, 57: 373-76, May.

216. Did Sh miss the road to Warkworth?—A. B. Langdale—SAB, 17: 156-59, July.

Henry VI (H6)

217. Sh's Henry VI as a pacifist.—M. Swayner.—College English, 3: 143-49, Nov. 1941.

Julius Caesar (JC)

218. Sh's JC, a 17th-century manuscript.—G. B. Evans.—JEGP, 41: 401-17, Oct.

219. 'The most—unkindest'—P. R. Cole.—NQ, 183: 382, Nov. 7.

220. Sh-deutsch.—W. Fischer.—Bei, 52: 66-67, Mar. 1941.

King Lear (KL)

221. Elizn 'che vore ye' 'I warrant you.'—H. Kökeritz.—MLN, 57: 98-102, Feb.

222. The two techniques in KL.—W. B. C. Watkins.—RES, 18: 1-26, Jan.

223. W. Greg's *Variants in Q1 of 'KL'*—J. G. McManaway.—MLR, 37: 86-88, Jan.

Love's Labor's Lost (LLL)

224. The source of LLL.—J. Phelps.—SAB, 17: 97-102, Apr.

225. An allusion in Act IV.—H. W. Crundell.—NQ, 183: 44-45, July 18.

Macbeth (M)

226. Before M.—J. Gielgud.—TAM, 26: 113-17, Feb.

227. Evans' M.—R: Gilder.—TAM, 26: 80-81, Feb., 2 ils.

228. Shu cuts in Restoration Dublin.—H. Spencer.—PMLA, 57: 575-76, June.

229. J. Gielgud's M.—A. Dukes.—Theatre Arts, 26: 615-19, Oct., 2 ils.

230. James I & the witch-scenes in M.—H. V. Calhoun.—SAB, 17: 184-89, Oct.

231. The date of M.—A. N. Stunz.—ELH, 9: 95-105, June.

232. Sh's purgative drug 'cyme'—N. E. Eliason.—MLN, 57: 663-65, Dec.

233. D: Tieck's M-Uebersetzung.—T. Neale.—Bei, 52: 67-70, Mar. 1941.

Measure for Measure (MM)

234. The ambiguity of MM.—L. C. Knights.—Scrutiny, 10: 222-33, Jan.

235. The greatness of MM.—F. R. Leavis.—Scrutiny, 10: 234-47, Jan.

236. 'MM.'—D. A. Traversi.—Scrutiny, 11: 40-58, July.

Merchant of Venice (MV)

237. The 'muddy vesture of decay.'—Hibernicus.—NQ, 182: 275, May 16.

238. Launcelot's blessing.—S. M. Pitcher.—PQ, 21: 239, Apr.

Merry Wives of Windsor (MW)

239. MW & Two Brethren.—D: H. Bruce.—SP, 39: 241-64, Apr.

240. The MW quarto, a farce interlude.—V. H. Ogburn.—PMLA, 57: 654-60, Sept.

Midsummer-Night's Dream

241. A fair vestal throned by the west.—F. A. G. Calthorpe.—Baconiana, 26: 171-72, July.

Much Ado About Nothing (MA)

242. Spenserian 'courtesy' & 'temperance' in MA.—A. F. Potts.—SAB, 17: 103-11 (Apr.), 126-33 (July).

243 A possible source for the Hero-Claudio plot.—D. J. Gordon.—SP, 39: 278-90, Apr.

244. Benedick & Beatrice.—J. W. Draper.—JEGP, 41: 140-49, Apr.

Othello (O)

245. A scene from Robeson's *O*.—Theatre Arts, 26: 648, Oct.

246. Scenes from Robeson's *O*.—Life, Aug 31, pp. 82-85.

247 *O* & C. F. Cresinus.—E. H. W. Meyerstein.—TLS, Feb., p. 72

Pericles

248. 'Portage' [III, 1, 35] emended.—B. Lloyd.—NQ, 182: 342-43, June 20

Richard II (R2)

249. Imagery in *R2* and in *H4*.—M. Doran.—MLR, 37: 113-22, Apr.

250. The character of Richard II.—J. W. Draper.—PQ, 21: 228-36, Apr.

Richard III (R3)

251. Two passages in *R3*.—P. Maas.—RES, 18: 315-17, July.

Romeo & Juliet (R & J)

252. An Emendation in *R & J*.—H. E. Cain.—SAB, 17: 57-60, Jan.

253. Rosaline Rosalind.—Ignoto.—NQ, 183: 163, Sept. 12.

254. Sh's debt to Marlowe in *R & J*.—H. R. Walley.—PQ, 21: 257-67, July.

Sonnets

255. Seed of a Sh sonnet.—A. Davenport.—NQ, 182: 242-44, May 2.

256. Critical principles & sonnet 146.—D. A. Stauffer.—American Scholar, 12: 52-62, Dec.

257. Sonnet 149.—D. Bray.—TLS, July 4, p. 381.

Taming of the Shrew (TS)

258. *TS*.—T. King.—SAB, 17: 73-79, Apr.

259. Strata in *TS*.—R. A. Houk.—SP, 39: 291-302, Apr.

260. *TS*. [Adapted for the Blackfriars of Alabama.]—L. Raines, ed.—University, pp. 25.

261. The evolution of *TS*.—R. A. Houk.—PMLA, 57: 1009-38, Dec.

The Tempest (T)

262. Brown U Presents Sock & Buskin in 'T' with 'Revels' End' (A Containing Dialogue in 3 scenes).—W. T. Hastings.—Sept. 1942, pp. 12, port & 2 pls

Timon of Athens (Timon)

263. *Timon*. an unfinished play.—U. Ellis-Fermor.—RES, 18: 270-83, July

Titus Andronicus

264. The hardboiled Sh.—W. T. Hastings.—SAB, 17: 114-25, July, 3 pls

Troilus & Cressida (T&C)

265. Troilus, Cressida, & Thersites.—W. W. Lawrence.—MLR, 37: 422-37, Oct 1942.

Twelfth Night (TN)

266. 'Et in Illyria Feste' [Concluded].—J. W. Draper.—SAB, 17: 25-32, Jan.

267. Sh's use of 'pistol'.—G. S. McCue.—Amer Notes & Queries, 2: 104, Oct.

POETICS

269. The nature of poetry.—A. Stalker.—Quarterly R, 278: 74-86, Jan.

270. Beauty in Sh & in Kant.—Baron von Oppell.—Hibbert J, 40: 166-73, Jan.

271. *Poetry Writing & Appreciation*.—F. R. Horton.—N. Y.: H. Harrison, \$2.

272. *Poetry & Prophecy*.—N. K. Chadwick.—Cambr UP, pp. xvi + 110, 8 pl., \$1.75.

273. When is it poetry?—G. R. Hamilton; C. Sansom; E. Hutton, *et al.*—TLS, Feb. 7, 1942 (p. 67), Feb. 14 (p. 79), Feb. 21 (p. 92), Feb. 28 (p. 103).

274. F. W. Ness's *Use of Rhyme*.—J. W. Draper.—MLN, 57: 379-80, May.

275. *The Nature of Literature: Its Relation to Science, Language & Human Experience*.—T. C. Pollock.—Princeton UP, pp. xxiv + 218, \$3.

276. When is it poetry?—W. H. D. Rouse—TLS, May 2, p. 223.

277. Poetry & prophecy.—D Kenmare.—Poetry R, 33: 41-49, Jan.

278. *The Substance That Is Poetry*.—R. P. T. Coffin—N. Y.: Macmillan, \$2.

279. *The Mind of the Maker*.—D. L. Sayers.—N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., \$2.

280. Fundamentals of criticism.—Mother Agatha.—Spirit, 9: 115-19, Sept.

281. Reason in poetry.—G. Paulding.—Spirit, 9: 52-57, May.

282. Poetry & democracy.—C. I. Glicksberg.—South Atlantic Q, 41: 254-65, July.

283. Poetry for the populace.—R. Z. Deats.—Sewanee R, 50: 374-88, July.

284. When is it poetry?—TLS, Feb. 7, p. 67.

285. Unconscious expectations in reading poetry.—M. H. Abrams.—ELH, 9: 235-44, Dec.

286. Poetry in the doldrums.—S. A. Coblenz.—PL, 48: 221-27.

Poetry in the doldrums.—J. Heard.—PL, 48: 227-31.

287. Recent Catholic views on art & poetry.—K. Gilbert.—J of Philosophy, 39: 654-61, Nov. 19.

288. Figures of speech: irony.—J. Green.—NQ, 181: 271-72, Nov. 15, 1941.

289. Imagery & logic: Ramus & metaphysical poetics.—R. Ture.—J of the Hist of Ideas, 3: 365-400, Oct.

290. *The Language of Poetry*.—P. Wheelwright, C. Brooks, I. A. Richards, W. Stevens.—Princeton, pp. x + 126, \$2.

291. *Types of Engl Poetry*.—J. S. Harrison.—Indianapolis 1941, pp. x + 230.

292. Metaphysical poetry.—D. C. Loomba.—Calcutta R, 80: 67-75, July 1941.

293. *Poetry as a Means of Grace*.—C. G. Osgood.—Princeton UP, 1941, pp. viii + 132, \$2.

294. The sources of C. Gildon's *Complete Art of Poetry*.—F. E. Litz.—ELH, 9: 118-35, June.

295. Form in lit.—V. M. Hamm.—Thought, 17: 255-69, June.

POLITICS

296. The creative artist & his age.—P. Roy—Calcutta R, 81: 273-82, Dec 1941.

297. A. Thaler's *Sh & Democracy*.—G. I. Duthie.—RES, 18: 346-49, July.

298. Politics & the poet.—J. E. Spingarn.—Atlantic Mo, 170: 73-78, Nov.

299. Sh on degree: a study in backgrounds.—P. Deutschbetrger.—SAB, 17: 200-07, Oct

PREDECESSORS

300. *Representative Medieval & Tudor Plays*. [Translated, edited & abridged.]—H. W. Wells & R. S. Loomis edd & trr.—N. Y.: Sheed & Ward, pp. iv + 302, 4 pl. \$3 50.

RALEIGH, W.

301. W. R. as a transition figure.—E. A. Strathmann.—HLQ, 5: 190-92, Jan.

RANDOLPH, THOMAS

302. T. R.'s *Salting*.—F. Bowers.—MP, 39: 275-80, Feb.

303. *The Fairy Knight, or Oberon the Second*.—F. T. Bowers, ed.—Chapel Hill, pp. viii + 88, \$3.

RELIGION

304. Elizn sermons—W. Jaggard—NQ, 182: 25, Jan. 10.

305. J. B. Collins's *Christian Mysticism in the Elizn Age*.—F. E. Hutchinson—RES, 18: 340-41, July.

306. Sh's Anschauungen u Religion u Sittlichkeit, Staat u Volk—P. Meissner—Bei, 52: 60-64, Mar. 1941.

307. The Jacobean oath of allegiance & Engl lay Catholics—C. J. Ryan—Catholic Historical R, 28: 159-83, July.

RUSSIA

308. Sh in the new Soviet theatre.—J. Macleod.—Anglo-Soviet J, 3 17-24, Jan, 4 ils.

309. The Soviet public & Sh—L. G. Salinger—Anglo-Soviet J, 3 228-34, Oct., 8 ils.

309a. Language & style of Sh—M. Morozov—*Hist of Engl Realism* (I. Anisimov, ed., 1941).

SENECA

310. *Our Seneca*.—C. W. Mendell—New Haven, 1941, pp. x + 286.—R. M. Hayward, MLN, 57: 228-30, Mar.

311. Was *Hercules* modeled on an earlier Latin play?—R. M. Hayward.—Classical J, 38: 98-101, Nov.

SHIRLEY, JAMES

312. J. Sh & the actors at the 1st Irish theater.—A. H. Stevenson.—MP, 40: 147-60, Nov.

SIDNEY, PHILIP

313. Parallel analyses of the two versions of the *Arcadia*.—A. G. D. Wiles.—SP, 39: 167-206, Apr.

SPENSER, E.

314. The woman ruler in *FQ*.—J. E. Phillips Jr.—HLQ, 5: 211-34, Jan.

315. Sp's garden of Adonis revisited.—J: W. Bennett.—JEGP, 41: 53-78, Jan

316. E K's classical allusions reconsidered.—D. T. Starnes—SP, 39: 143-59, Apr

317. *The Evolution of 'FQ'*.—J. W. Bennett.—U of Chicago, pp x + 300, \$3.

318. Criticism criticised Sp & Milton.—E. E. Stoll.—JEGP, 41: 451-77, Oct.

319. Sp's 'Platonic' garden—B. Stirling.—JEGP, 41: 482-86, Oct.

320. Methods of literary interpretation—J. W. Bennett.—JEGP, 41: 486-89.

321. Shelley & Sp—F. L. Jones—SP 39: 662-69, Oct.

322. Sp & the graces.—D. T. Starnes—PQ, 21: 268-82, July.

323. Imagery in *FQ* based on domestic & occupational life—G: W. Landrum.—SAB, 17: 190-99, Oct.

324. Spenserian armor.—A. H. Gilbert—PMLA, 57: 981-87, Dec.

325. The genesis of some passages which Sp borrowed fr Marlowe—T. W. Baldwin.—ELH, 9: 157-87, Sept.

326. Sp & the 'cinq points en amours'—J. Hutton.—MLN, 57: 657-61, Dec.

STAGE HISTORY

327. *Annals of the N. Y. Stage: Vol. 13 (1885-88)*.—G. C. D. Odell.—N. Y.: Columbia UP, pp. xviii + 724, many ils, \$8.75.

STUART, MARIE

328. *The Gay Galliard: The Love Story of Mary Queen of Scots*. [A novel].—M. Irwin.—N. Y.: Harcourt, pp. 544, \$3.—H. Gorman; N. Y. Times Book R, Feb. 15, p. 4, port.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

329. Press corrections in 16th- and 17th-century quartos—E. Wolf 2d—Papers of the Bibliographical Soc. of America, 36: 1-12 (Repr.)

330. An evaluation of evidence in Shn textual criticism.—M: Doran.—*Engl Institute Annual*, 1941 (N. Y.: Columbia UP, \$2.50), pp. 95-114.

THEATRES

331. *The Globe Playhouse: Its Design & Equipment*.—J. C. Adams.—Cambridge, Mass.: HUP, pp. xiv + 420, 17 ils, \$5.—S.A.T., SAB, 17: 160, July.—J. Corbin; N. Y. Times Book R, Sept. 27, p. 34.—S. C. Chew; N. Y. Herald Tribune Books, Aug. 2, p. 14 VIII.

332. Sh's audience as viewed by Harbage.—B. R. Lewis.—SAB, 17: 150-55, July.

TOURNEUR, CYRIL

333. The ascription of speeches in *Revenger's Tragedy*.—E. M. Waith.—MLN, 57, 119-21, Feb.

TRAGEDY

334. Tragedy & sense of the tragic in its ethical implications.—G. R. Coffman.—*Sewanee R*, 50: 26-34, Mar.

335. The nature of tragedy.—A. H. B. Allen.—*Philosophy*, 17: 144-58, Apr.

WARWICKSHIRE

336. *Sh's Country*.—J. Russell.—Ln: Batsford, 10s. 6d.—(TLS, May 16, p. 248.)

WHETSTONE, GEORGE

337. *G. W.: Mid-Elizabethan Gentleman of Letters*.—T. C. Izard.—CUP, pp. x + 298, \$3.75.

WORKS

338. *Complete Plays & Poems of Wm. Sh.* [With introductions & notes.]—W. A. Neilson & C. J. Hill, edd.—Boston: Houghton Mifflin, \$6.50.

ADDENDA

339. Sh in the garden of Eden.—R. A. Law.—*Studies in Engl* (Texas, 1941), pp. 24-38 (Repr.)

340. An Echo of Homer in *Henry V*?—R. A. Law.—*Studies in Engl* (Texas, 1942), pp. 105-09. (Repr.)

341. Another play by J. Ford.—G. F. Sabaugh.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 595-601, Dec.

342. J. Donne & the Earl of Essex.—R. E. Bennett.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 603-04, Dec.

343. Sp's *View*: some observations.—R. Heffner.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 507-15, Dec.

344. A Copley's *A Fig for Fortune*,—a Roman Catholic legend of holiness.—F. M. Padelford.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 525-33, Dec.

345. S. Batman's *Travayled Pilgrime* & Book 2 of *FQ*.—K. Koller.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 535-41, Dec.

346. The 'G. W. Senior' & 'G. W. I.' of the *Amoretti*.—R. Gottfried.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 543-46, Dec.

347. Sp's tale of the 2 sons of Milesio.—Roland M. Smith.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 547-57, Dec.

348. A Tasso imitation in Sp.—C. B. Beall.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 559-60, Dec.

349. Sp's *View* & the tradition of the 'wild' Irish.—W. J. Ong.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 561-71, Dec.

350. Sidney's 2 descriptions of poetry.—C. M. Dowlin.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 573-81, Dec.

351. S. Daniel's *Philotas* & the Essex case.—B. Stirling.—Mod. Lang. Q, 3: 583-94, Dec.

352. What Sh learned at school.—D. Brown.—*Bucknell U Studies* (1941) 1: 1-20.

353. Valency's *Tragedies of Herodes & Mariamne*.—R. P. Rosenberg.—German Q, 15: 114-16, Mch.

354. 'Pistle' or 'Pistoll' in *Twelfth Night*.—G. S. McCue.—NQ, 183: 345, Dec. 5.

355. Sixteenth-century religious & political implications in *Sir John Oldcastle*.—M. G. M. Adkins.—*Studies in English* (Texas U, 1942), pp. 86-104. (Repr.)

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occurring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics
for 1942*

Compiled by RALPH P. ROSENBERG

A

Abbey K 51
Abrams M H 285
Abrams W A 99
Abstracts 1-2
Acting 207 227 229 245-46 260 308 312
Adams J C 331
Adams J Q 181
Adaptations 260
Adkins G M 355
Agatha, Mother 280
Alabama, Blackfriars of 260
Alchemy 153
Allen A H B 335
Allen D C 6 109
America, Sh and 3-4 38 185
Amorette 346
Anderson F H 9
Ansizimov I 309
Anthologies 5
Appearance and reality in Sh's plays 81
Arciniega R. 147
Armstrong C. 49
Arnold F H 11
Arnold, Matthew 85
Astrology 6
As You Like It 59
Atkinson J B 212
Authorship problems 7 264
Autographs 8

B

Bacon, Francis 9-15
Bacon—Sh question 17-32
Bakeless J 158 173 177 179 198
Baker H K 28
Baldwin T W 40 325
Barents, Wm 77
Barnes B 103

Barr S 211
Bartlett P: B 63 65 67
Bartley J O 100
Bateson F 35
Batman S 345
Battenhouse R W 114 167
Bayley H 159
Beall C B 348
Beauty in Sh and Kant 270
Belloc H 125
Bennett H S 87
Bennett J: W 165 315 317 320
Bennett R E 109 342
Bentley G 97 155
Bernhardt, Sarah 207
Berveiller, M 156
Bhattacherjee M M 146
Bible, Bacon—Sh and the 17
Bibliography 33-39 107 112 138 191
Biddulph L 12
Bindoff S T 94
Biographical dictionary of Elizn authors
Biography 30 40-44
Birss J H 2
Blaisdell E: 1
Blumenthal A v 120
Boas F S 37 169
Bond D F 35
Book titles from Sh 45-61
Bowers F 302-03
Brahms C 19
Brandenburg A. S 111
Bray D 257
Breton, Nicholas 62
Brewen J 157
Bridgewater H S 25
Brooke T 105
Brooks C 268
Brown D 352
Brown University 262

*Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the baptismal name. Sh=Shakspeare.

Bruce D: H 239
 Bryan W F 180
 'Bug' in Sh & contemporaries 163
 Byron, Lord 86

C

Cain H E 252
 Calhoun H V 230
 Calthorpe F A G 241
 Campbell M: 129
 Campbell O J 90
 Caroline stage 97
 Carroll P V 54
 Castro A 135
 Catholic views on art & poetry 287
 Catholics, Francis Bacon and the 13
 Cawley R R 98 127
 Chadwick N K 272
 Chamber R W 180
 Chapman, George 63-69
 Chase F 50
 Chew S C 331
 China & Sh 212
 Clarkson P S 164
 Classical allusions in Spenser 316
 Cleveland Sh garden 185
 Coblenz S A 286
 Coffin R P T 278
 Coffman G R 334
 Cole P R 219
 Coles M 58
 Collier J P 157
 Collins J B 305
 Comedy 24 31 32
Commedia dell'arte 70
 Commentary 71-90
 Contemporaries 91-95
 Contemporary drama 96-100
 Contemporary poetry 101-05 111
 Contemporary prose 106
 Conventions of old age & Sh 80
 Cooper H 115
 Copley A 344
 Corbin J 331
 Cosmic sense in Shn tragedy 199
 Cox E G 98
 Cox E H 80
 Craig H 76

Crane R 178
 Cresinus C F 247
 Criticism 280 318 320
 Crundell H W 225
Cymbeline 201

D

Daniel, Samuel 107 351
 Davenant, William 108
 Davenport A 104 140 176 255
 Deats R: Z 283
 Deckner E 79
 Delacroix E 184
 Democracy and Sh 74 297
 Democracy, Poetry and 282
 Despair theme in Marlowe 175
 Deutschberger P 299
 Dickens, Charles 86
 Dodd A 18
 Dodds M H 124
 Donne, John 109-18 342
 Doran M: 215 249 330
 Doran M V 211
 Dowlin C M 350
 Downes B 195
 Drake, Francis 92 95
 Drama 119-20
 Draper J W 244 250 266 274
 Drayton, Michael 121
 Dukes A 229
 Duncan E H 117 153
 Duthie G I 206 297

E

Eagle R L 14 20 22-23 26 43
 Eccles M 93 123 169
 Education & culture 122-23
 Egri L 119
 Eldredge J 45
 Eliason N E 232
 Elizabeth, Queen 124-25
 Elizabethan manners & morals 128
 Elizabethan propaganda 130
 Elizabethan reading 123
 Elizabethan sermons 304
 Ellis-Fermor U: 90 263
 Elton O 121
 Emblem literature and Francis Bacon 12

Emendations—*See* Textual criticism

Emerson, Ralph W 190

English scenery 108

English yeoman 129

Environment 126-30

Erasmus, Desiderius 131-35

Essex, Earl of 342 351

Evans G B 218

Evans, Maurice 227

F

Falk R P 4

Fear of people in Sh 75

Fellheimer J: 103

Fencing in Sh 89

Fenton G 103

Fischer W 220

Folger Sh Memorial Library 181

Ford J 341

France and Sh 184 192

Frost W 139

Frye N 102

G

Gardner H: L 168

Gascoigne, George 136-38

Gee J A 133

George C 183

Germany, Sh and 220 233

Gibson R W 15

Gielgud 226 229

Gilbert A H 324

Gilbert K: 287

Gilder R: 227

Gildons C 294

Glucksberg C I 282

Globe Playhouse 331

Gordon D J 243

Gorman H 125

Gorrell R M 157

Gottfried R 346

Grace W J 199

Grayson C: 45

Green J: 288

Greg W W 178 223

Greville, Fulke 139

Grierson H J C 141

H

Hall J: 29

Hamilton G R 273

Hamlet 202-13

Hamm V M 295

Harbage A 74 234

Hardman A G 13

Harmon A: 192

Harrison J S 291

Harvey, Gabriel 140

Hastings W T 262 264

Hathaway, Anne 41 182

Hayward R M 310-11

Heard J 286

Heffner R 343

Heller R 188

Henry IV 214-16 249*Henry V* 340*Henry VI* 7 217

Herbert, George 141

Herford C H 152

Herodes & Mariamne 353

Heroes and villains 86

Herrick, Robert 142

Heywood, John 143 300

'Hibernicus' 237

Hill C J 338

Hinterwaldner A 187

Historical drama 73

Homer 340

Hornstein L: H 162

Horton F R 271

Hotson L 186

Houk R A 259 261

Hudson A P 205

Hudson H H 101 133

Humor 144

Hutchinson F E 141 305

Hutton E 273 326

I

'Ignoto' 253

Iliads 65

Imagery 162

Influence 145

Ireland, Sh & 228

Irish theater 312

Irony 288
 Irwin M: 328
 Italy 146-48 156 195
 Italy in Elizn pamphlets 146
 Izard T C 337

J

Jackson J L 89 202
 Jacobean oath of allegiance 307
 Jacobean stage 97
 Jacobi 79
 Jaggard W 85 124 304
 James I 94 230
 Jaynes C: 46
 Jenkins G: 130
John Oldcastle, Sir 355
 Johnson E D 29
 Jones F L 321
 Jonson, Ben 149-56
Julius Caesar 54 218-20

K

K, E 316
 Kallrich M 149
 Kant, Emanuel 270
 Kelley M 47
 Kenmare D 277
 Kennedy M B 72
 Kilian E 189
 King A H 151
 King James on Francis Bacon 10
King John 46
King Lear 26 60 119 221-23
 King T 258
 Kingsley D P 36
 Kirschbaum L 172
 Knights L C 234
 Kocher P H 166 170-71
 Kökeritz H 160 221
 Koller K: 345
 Kolodin I 194
 Kyd, Thomas 157-58

L

Lamb, Charles 1-2
 Lamb, Mary 1
 Lambert R: 52
 Lamson R 5

Landrum G: W 323
 Langdale A B 216
 Langenbeck 120
 Language 159-63 219 221 354
 Law 164
 Law of property in Sh & Elizn Drama 164
 Law R A 339-40
 Lawrence W W 265
 Leavis F R 84 235
 Leith A A 24
 Lennon T 182
 Lewis B R 40 332
 Lieferant H 57
 Lieferant S: 57
 Literary method 162
 Litz F E 294
 Lloyd B 248
 Loane G G 66-67
 Loomba D C 292
 Loomis L S 143
 Loomis R S 300
 Lorn H v 134
 Love 32
Lovers' Labor's Lost 224-25
 Lyly, John 165

M

M, J G 163
 Maas P 251
Macbeth 48-50 53 55 61 119 226-33
 Machiavelli, Niccolo 147-48
 Macleod J 308
 Manuscripts 218
 Marlowe, Christopher 158 166-75 177 179
 198 254 325
 Marston, John 176-77
 Mason A B W 92
 Masques 154
 McCloskey J C 75 175
 McClure N E 10
 McCue G S 267 354
 McDowell J H 70
 McManaway J G 42 223
 McNeal T H 59
Measure for Measure 17 234-36
 Meissner P 306
 Melsome W S 21 32
 Mendell C W 310

Merchant of Venice 237-38
Merry Devil of Edmonton, The 99
Merry Wives of Windsor 239-40
 Metaphysical poetry 292
 Myerstein E H W 247
 Middleton, Thomas 86 178-79
Midsummer-Night's Dream 160 241
 Millar J S L 30
 Miscellanea 180-86
 Music 194 196

N

Modae C 144
 Monologue 187-89
 Montaigne, Michel de 190-92
 Morozov M 309a
 Motifs 75 86 353
Much Ado About Nothing 242-44
 Murchison K 27
 Music 193-96
 Music in poetry 102
 Nashe, Thomas 140 146 166 170
 Neale T 233
 Neilson W A 338
 Ness F W 274
 'Night-rule' in Sh 160
 Nutt S: M 77

O

Odell G C D 327
 Oehlenschläger 209
 Ogburn V H 240
Oldcastle, Sir John 355
 Ong W J 349
 Oppell, Baron von 270
 Osgood C G 293
Othello 56 245-47
 Oxford, Earl of 165

P

Padelford F M 344
 Parks G B 197
 Paulding G 281
 Pavý S 155
 Peacham H 127
 Pearson H 43
 Peele, George 197-98
Pericles 248
 Perkins R H 64

Phelps J 224
 Phillips J E 314
 Phillips M: M 131
 Phillpots E 55
 Philosophy 64 199-200
Philotas 351
 Pitcher S M 214 238
 'Platonic' garden of Spenser 319
 Platonic tradition & Sh 200
 Platonism, Francis Bacon on 9
 Plays & Poems 201-267
 Poems 38
 Poetics 102 268-95
 Politics 4 75 296-99 355
 Pollock-T C 83 275
 Pool R M 78
 Potts A: F 242
 Pozner V 53
 Predecessors 300
 Price H T 215
 Prior M E 213
 Propaganda poetry in England 105
Proverbs 17

Q

Queen Elizabeth 124-25

R

Raines L 260
 Raleigh, Walter 301
 Ramus 289
 Randolph, Thomas 302-03
 Ray P C 7
 Recorded music 194 196
 Religion 304-07 355
 Renaissance moral philosophy 167
 'Revels' End' 262
Richard II 58 249-50
Richard III 51 251
 Richards I A 268 290
 Robertson J: 62
 Robertson J 69 136
 Robeson, Paul 245-46
Romeo and Juliet 52 119 145 252-54
 Rosenberg R P 34 353
 Rouse W H D 276
 Roy P 296
 Rugoff M 125

Russell J 336
 Russia, Sh & 308-09a
 Ryan C J 307

S

Sale R 56
 Salingar L G 309
 Sampley A M 210
 Sansom C 273
 Sayers D: L 279
 Schirmer W F 73
 Schücking L L 208
 Seneca 310-11
 Sennett M 31
 Sensabaugh G F 341
 Shaaber M 215
 Sh and the 'wild' Irish 349
 Sh at school 352
 Sh's development as a dramatist 76
 Sh's diction 161
 Sh in the garden of Eden 339
 Sh's ladies 183
 Sh's marriage 42
 Sh, the oration in 72
 Sh's use of 'pistol' 267
 Sh's will 44

Shelley, Percy 321
 Shirley, James 312
 Shudofsky M M 207
 Sidney, Philip 313 350
 Simon S J 19
 Simpson C M 193
 Simpson E: M 113 152 154
 Simpson P 152
 Singleton C S 148
 Sisson C J 96-97 150
 Sleeper B R 203
 Smith H 5
 Smith L W 82
 Smith M E 3
 Smith, Roland M 347
 Social ideas in the Renaissance 126
Sonnets 255-57
 Sources 294 311 347
 Sources, Shn 224 237 243 247
 Southern R 108
 Speaking line & Sh 82
 Spencer H 206 228

Spencer T 81 88
 Spenser, Edmund 242 314-26 344-48
 Spenserian 'courtesy' & 'temperance' 242
 Spingarn J E 298
 Stage history & staging 96-97 100 327
 Stage Irishman, development of the 100
 Stalker A 269
 Starnes D T 316 322
 Stauffer D A 256
 Stein A 110
 Steinbeck J 48
 Stephenson A A 201
 Stevens W 268 290
 Stevenson A H 312
 Stirling B 319 351
 Stoll E E 86-87 318
 Story I C 106
 Strathmann E A 301
 Stuart, Mary 328
 Stuart stage history 96
 Stuarts, the early 91
 Stunz A N 231
 Swan M W S 38
 Swayner M: 217
 Swinnerton F 60

T

Taming of the Shrew 57 258-61
 Tannenbaum S A 33 41 107 138 185 191
 331
 Tasso 348
 Technique 76
Tempest, The 81 262
 Tennyson, Alfred 145
 Textual criticism 248 252 329-30
 Thaler A 74 297
 Theatres 331-32
 Themes 175
 Tieck, Dorothea 233
 Tillotson K: 121
Timon of Athens 263
 Tinker E L 132
Titus Adronicus 7 264
 Tourneur, Cyril 333
 Tragedy 334-35
 Translation 220 233
 Traversi D A 236
Troilus & Cressida 265

Tudor England 122
Tudor plays 300
Tudor popular music 193
Ture R 289
Twelfth Night 45 47 266-67 354

V

Valency M J 353
Verdi, Giuseppe 195

W

Waith E M 333
Wales J: G 204
Walley H R 254
Walsh G 78
Warren C T 164
Warwickshire 336
Watkins W B C 222
Webster M: 71 211
Wells H W 143 300

Wheelwright P 268 290
Whetstone, George 337
White M 61
White W 112
Whitman, Walt 4
Whitridge A 184
Wigmore J H 8
Wiles A G D 313
Willcock G D 151
Willey N L 209
Wilson F P 161
Wilson J 133
Winter's Tale, The 26 81
Wolf E 329
Works 338
Wrosh L C 180

Y

Yates F: A 200
Young C L 190

IMAGERY OF FIRE IN THE *FAERIE QUEENE*
BY GRACE W. LANDRUM
(Concluded)

THE myth of Prometheus will continue to enthrall poets. It has reappeared in our century, as in William Vaughn Moody's *The Fire-Bringer*. The great Aeschylean conception will recur, but with varied social implications, rather than with man's simple wonder at that Promethean heat of Othello's magnificent reference in the death scene of Desdemona. The mystery of fire largely disappeared with the illuminating match, unfamiliar to English poets until the second third of the nineteenth century. The Renaissance mind, that did not know Browning's "blue spurt of a lighted match," felt the magic of the kindling process. Furthermore, fires were unconcealed then. Now in our civilian, urban life they are largely guarded from sight. Accordingly flames, against which there was once the scantiest protection, stimulated an enormous amount of sixteenth century imagery. This seems less trite if one reads with a visualization of Elizabethan daily life and with a little imagination, remembering that today fire beyond its bounds is man's greatest terror still.

A glance at the *Concordance to the Poems of Edmund Spenser* and at Whitman's *Subject-Index* will prove the numerosity of the poet's references to fire. As Shelley's mind was obsessed by the experience of drowning, so Spenser may have been haunted by the thought of such a holocaust as he probably saw at the destruction of Kilcolman Castle.

The treatment of the imagery of fire may begin with Mutability's analysis of the element:

 Last is the fire: which, though it liue for euer,
 Ne can be quenchēd quite; yet, euery day,
 Wee see his parts, so soone as they do seuer,
 To lose their heat, and shortly to decay;
 So, makes himself his owne consuming pray.
 Ne any liuing creatures doth he breed;
 But all, that are of others bredd, doth slay;
 And with their death, his cruell life dooth feed;
 Not leauing but their barren ashes, without seede.¹

Spenser's imagery drawn from fire I shall classify thus: figures based on the similarity of fire to the sheen of metals;

comparisons of animal physique to manifestations of fire; human behavior characterized first by the beneficent and then by the devastating power of the element.

Like Chaucer, Spenser was continually charmed by the sunlike flash of metals. He notes general effects: metal "shining like Sunne rays"; armor shining like "Phoebus bright ray"; "sun bright arms"; armor "bright as skie." A splendid picture shows Radigund's armor hammered by Artegall:

So did Sir Artegall upon her lay,
As if she had an yron anduile beene,
That flakes of fire, bright as the sunny ray,
Out of her steely armes were flashing seene,
That all on fire ye would her surely weene.²

Mention of particular weapons is frequent. The flaming sword, blade, or brand is a favorite. Not only does Arthur's shield (composed of solid diamond, of course, and not of metal) flash with the blinding effect of sunlight, but so do other "sun bright" and "sun broad" shields. Radigund wears a "sunshiny helmet." Derivative as the imagery may be, yet in itself it has been influential.³ Nevertheless, because of its familiarity it needs no further emphasis.

Passing from comparisons of warlike equipment to fire and the likeness of the element to human characteristics, we may note the non-human "flaming tongue of Cerberus" (Vergilian, of course),⁴ the nostrils of Enceladus like a "furnace red" (perhaps a Vergilian phrase),⁵ "the flaming breath of steeds," and the "fiery feet" of Guyon's horse.

The great fiery dragon of Book I, Cantos XI and XII, belongs in a specialized study of Spenser's fabulous creatures.⁶ In passing, one may express surprise that the phoenix, dear to Elizabethans, scarcely occurs in Spenser's poetry.

In our age generalizations of human behavior tend to splinter into special characterizations, under the domination of psychology. A few stock comparisons remain, probably not to be increased. Spenser's variation of the fiery eye appears in "sparkling fire out of furious eyes," eyes "casting secret flashes of lustful fire." By another conception the eyes of wounded Timias are like "lamps of quenched fire."

A charming simile depicts Britomart's eyes shining through her beaver while

"from her eies did flash out fiery light
Like coles, that through a silver censer sparkle bright."⁷

The beauty of this figure redeems the inept comparison in the Allegory of the Body in Book II, Canto IX: eyes like "two goodly Beacons," a phrase which, apart from its context, would still allure.⁸ (A beacon, name lingering delightfully in the hills of Gloucestershire and Somerset, must have been really significant in the poet's troubled years in Ireland.) Additionally he speaks of thirst as "flaming," of the "fervent heat" of the feasters' appetites in Castle Joyous, and of the "molten heart" steamed in sleep.

For most of the moral attributes Spenser signally honored he has images of fire. Obviously he cannot thus symbolize his grand virtue of temperance. Fire is not easily a general symbol of friendship, justice or courtesy. But several interlocking excellencies he typifies by fire: virtue, noble ambition, courage, righteous indignation: the "zealous fire of noble thoughts"; the freshly kindled "spark" of response to noble lineage; the "broad-blazed fame" of the Red Cross Knight, to quote Dame Coelia's words; and that of other knights of "strange adventures" who won "great worth and worship." Fame, courage, honor, he thus lists in Calidore's reluctant refusal of Tristram's assistance:

"Glad would I surely be, thou courteous Squire,
To haue thy presence in my present quest,
That mote thy kindled courage set on fire,
And flame forth honour in thy noble brest."⁹

Courage, as a discrete virtue, if it ever be that, he repeatedly likens to fire. "Sparks of noble courage," "heat of youthful spite" (in a purely favorable connection) he varies with "flaming courage." Especially he likes figuratively to revive courage with fresh sparks. He had no doubt endlessly enjoyed the brightening of a sickly fire on his own hearth. An opposite effect, of fire suppressed and then let loose, appears in a powerful simile:

Like as a fire, the which in hollow caue
Hath long beene ynderkept, and downe supprest,
With murmurous disdaine doth inly rauie,
And grudge, in so streight prison to be prest,

At last breakes forth with furious unrest,
And striues to mount unto his natvie seat;
All that did earst it hinder and molest,
It now deuoures with flame and scorching heat,
And carries into smoake with rage and horror great.¹⁰

Sheer physical courage, though exemplified a thousand-fold, is not a definitive impulse in the noblest of the *Faerie Queene* knights. Righteous indignation of the Psalmist's intensity often motivates. Red Cross experiences a "fier" if impermanent zeal at the first sight of Despair. The heart of Calidore did "inly flame" at an unavenged wrong. The fisherman's assault upon Florimell incites "burning fury." The misery of the Squire in Squallid Weed beside his headless lady so stings Artegall and Talus that they "flamed with zeale of vengeance inwardly" and rode in hot pursuit of the murderer. In true Spenserian fashion the courage to avenge the wrongs of others blends with compassion. One of the most beautiful aphorisms which are seldom noticed unless they sparkle in alexandrines, is:

"For wheres no courage, theres no ruth nor mone."¹¹

Figures concerning tearful sympathy with wronged innocence naturally belong in another category. Incidentally Spenser has an interesting reference to himself, not, of course, as a physical champion of distress, but as a sensitive onlooker, when he tells us that in recounting the woes of Florimell his heart doth "melt with mere compassion." If one doubts his sincerity, let him remember that William and Mary Wordsworth shed tears over Una's plight when they read the *Faerie Queene* as a solace in deep bereavement.

In recounting "faithfull loves" Spenser would normally repeat figures drawn from fire, stock phrases of other poets; yet he makes them his own. Elton excellently expresses the obligation thus: "No need to ask whether he borrows; it is enough to see that he writes."¹² We may rank the intensity of love as a pure passion in an ascending scale, beginning with Arthur's analysis to Una of the course of love:

Deare Dame (quote he), you sleeping sparkes awake,
Which troubled once, into huge flames will grow,
Ne euer will their feruent fury slake
Till liuing moysture into smoake do flow,
And wasted life do lye in ashes low.

Yet sithens silence lessenneth not my fire,
 But told it flames, and hidden it does glow,
 I will reuele, what ye so much desire:
 Ah Loue, lay downe thy bow, the whiles I may respire.¹³

Frequently appear the "fire of loue," "the goodly fire," "the kindly flame of loue," the "creeping flames," the fair Lady "inflamed by loue's rage," the "no unusual fire of loue," and the further incitement to passion when "fresh coles" are laid. The connotation in each of these cases is of chaste love, pleasurable if mixed with pain. The emotion of Britomart, enamored of Artegall, rises thus to dangerous intensity:

Ne ought it mote the noble Mayd auayle,
 Ne slake the furie of her cruell flame,
 But that she still did waste, and still did wayle,
 That through long languour, and hart-burning brame
 She shortly like a pynëd ghost became,
 Which long hath waited by the Stygian strand.¹⁴

By an extension, fire becomes an emblem of the good life, as well as of the good lover:

Most sacred fire, that burnëst mightily
 In living brests, ykindled first aboue,
 Emongst th' eternall spheres and lamping sky,
 And thence pourd into men, which men call Loue;
 Not that same, which doth base affections moue
 In brutish minds, and filthy lust inflame,
 But that sweet fit, that both true beautie loue,
 And choseth vertue for his dearest Dame,
 Whence spring all noble deeds and neuer dying fame.¹⁵

Lastly, the element symbolizes the highest reach of human aspiration in an address to "the greate Muse."

Yet sith I needs must follow thy behest,
 Doe thou my weaker wit with skill inspire,
 Fit for this turne; and in my feeble brest
 Kindle fresh sparkes of that immortall fire,
 Which learnëd minds inflameth with desire
 Of heauenly things.¹⁶

Turning to imagery of fire as an evil force we may observe that there is little suggestion from the idea of smoke. The word appears often concretely; seldom figuratively, as in "smoke of vanity," and in the splendid alexandrine in the description of the fire in the cave.¹⁷ Ashes, as distinct from the generating fire, Spenser practically omits, but repeats the Chaucerian comparison of pallid cheeks to ashes.

To a remarkable degree manifestations of unruly human passions are likened to fire. One is tempted to draw a fantastic Renaissance design of the Seven Deadly Sins with the separate figures at least of five of the Sins—Pride, Lechery, Avarice, Envy, Wrath—lapped in curling flames. Sloth naturally is absent. Thus, griefs concealed are compared to flames. The misery of Scudamour is like a fire to be quenched. To return to the Sins, Pride is characterized as “blazing.” Impatience, one of the two old hags following Maleger, is armed with raging flame. Avarice in the great Cave of Mammon scene is thus described :

Then auarice gan through his veines inspire
His greedy flames, and kindled life-deuouring fire.¹⁸

Malice with its “furious flames” is close akin to envy, which may include the “kindling coles” of cruel enmity. Revenge all “burning with a fresh desire” and with “hasty heat” is properly next.

Generalizations of wrath or anger as fiery occur insistently. An unusually aphoristic stanza thus defines wrath combined with other passions :

Wrath, gealosie, grieve, loue dc thus expell.
Wrath is a fire, and gealosie a weede,
Grief is a flood, and loue a monster fell:
The fire of sparkes, the weede of little seede,
The flood of drops, the Monster filth did breed.¹⁹

Among numerous similar expressions occur these : a heart “molten by wrath,” “flaming furie,” “euer burning wrath,” the “brand of ire,” “wrathful fire,” “wrath euer burning.” Marked discord begins with “small sparks,” which once blown, are unquenchable except by a god or “godlike man.” Strife and war are likewise “kindled.” Very striking are characterizations of wrathful individuals. The Two Brothers whom Artegall later appeased are in the quarrel over their inheritance kindled “with wrathfull fires.”²⁰ Orgoglio is “inflamed with scornful wrath.” Artegall and the “cursed, cruell Sarazin” demanding passage money at the bridge meet in combat so furious that

There being both together in the floud,
They each at other tyrannously flew;
Ne ought in water coolēd their whot bloud,
But rather in them kindled choler new.²¹

Three characters conceived with even exceptional power show fiery qualities. Orgoglio is inflamed with "scornful wrath." Radigund at her castle gates is "inflamed with fell despight." Pyrocles is by derivation the embodiment of fire unquenchable.²² Equipped with his shield of brass, the inscription on it, *Burnt, I do burn*, armed with poisoned arrows, he gives forth such outcries when he seeks to quench "his implacable fire," his "inly flaming syde," that he is worthy the imagination of Dante and the terrible irony of Swift.²³

Spenser's greatest emphasis falls on the treatment of fire as symbolizing sinful passion. He does not announce the sharp antithesis of love and lust that occurs in *Venus and Adonis*:

Love comforteth like sunshine after rain,
But Lust's effect is tempest after sun:
Love's gentle spring doth always fresh remain,
Lust's winter comes ere summer half be done;
Love surfeits not; Lust like a glutton dies;
Love is all truth, Lust full of forged lies.²⁴

Nevertheless, the context clearly differentiates the natures and the effects of chaste love and lawless passion. Thus from Arthur's recital of his past, Troilus-like amusement at lovers' plights, we understand that by "the fires which them [the lovers] to ashes brent," he means only honorable love. By contrast in other situations we read of "the fleshly flame," "the flamed mind," "the cruel flame of loue," the "secret coles put to its fire," the "kindling coles of lust," "the burning eye" of Desire, "newly kindled youthful desire," the boiling fire of love, flames inly burning, most raging hot. "Lustful fire" occurs more than once. The emotion is sometimes delineated with a complete abandon which is the equivalent of salaciousness in the language of contemporary drama. Fire consumes Malbecco's heart, Sylvanus "burnt in his retreat." Acrasia sucking Guyon's spright through his human eyes "was quite molten into lust." The Witch's son:

Cast to loue her [Florimell] in his brutish mind;
No loue, but brutish lust, that was so beastly tind.
Closely the wicked flame his bowels brent,
And shortly grew into outrageous fire.²⁵

One more case, that of Clarinda, will suffice:

Euen so Clarinda her owne Dame begyld,
And turn'd the trust, which was in her affyde,
To feeding of her priuate fire, which boyld
Her inward brest, and in her entraycles fryde,
The more that she it sought to couer and to hyde.²⁶

Surely here is "lust in action," a vicarious delineation of "the expense of spirit in a waste of shame," to delineate which Spenser would have been far less compelling without his superb use of the imagery of fire.

It is perhaps significant that the river of the classic underworld of which he speaks oftenest is Phlegethon.

¹*FQ*, 7, 7, 24.

²*FQ*, 5, 5, 8, 1-5. For recent interesting treatment of Radigund see Celeste Turner Wright, *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 37, July, 1940, pp. 441 and *passim*.

³*Variorum I*, 198.

⁴*Variorum III*, 234.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 279.

⁶See the author's mention of these in the *Shakespeare Association Bulletin*, "Imagery in the *Faerie Queene* drawn from Flora and Fauna," Vol. XVI, No. 2 and 3.

⁷*FQ*, 5, 6, 38, 7-9.

⁸See *Variorum I*, 298 for parallels.

⁹*FQ*, 6, 2, 37, 1-4.

¹⁰*FQ*, 2, 11, 32.

¹¹*FQ*, 6, 7, 18, 5.

¹²"Colour and Imagery in Spenser," *Modern Studies*, London, Edwin Arnold, 1907, p. 72.

¹³*FQ*, 1, 9, 8.

¹⁴*FQ*, 3, 2, 52, 1-6.

¹⁵*FQ*, 3, 3, 1. See *Variorum III*, 233 for Upton's comment on Platonic source.

¹⁶*FQ*, 7, 2, 1-6. *Variorum VI* and *VII*, 291-2.

¹⁷See note 10, *supra*.

¹⁸*FQ*, 2, 7, 17, 8-9.

¹⁹*FQ*, 2, 1, 35. See *Variorum III*, 230 for comment of B. E. C. Davis.

²⁰*FQ*, 5, 4, 4, 5ff

²¹*FQ*, 5, 2, 13, 1-4.

²²See *Variorum II*, 231, 247 for comment on the name and Gilbert's list of all his epithets drawn from fire.

²³*FQ*, 2, 6, 44, 3ff.

²⁴*Ll.* 800-804.

²⁵*FQ*, 3, 7, 15, 8-9; and stanza 16, 1-2.

²⁶*FQ*, 5, 5, 53, 5-9.

A MIRROR OF NATIONAL INTEGRATION

A New Summary of Four Decades of the English Theatre

By HENRY W. WELLS

THE strength of a cooperative effort by all productive classes of a complex society is well illustrated by a notable chapter in theatrical history. The evolution of the English theatre throughout the forty years preceding Shakspere's first plays offers an unsurpassed record of social integration. The highly privileged classes proved willing to accept much from the less privileged; the popular mind won a direct contact with the aristocratic mind; and, to conclude, a nation in time of relative peace achieved a unity in its spiritual life attained elsewhere only under the most stringent conditions of total war. The history of the pre-Shaksperian English stage takes on today a new meaning, of no small value to both the British and the American democracies.

This article aims to trace the outlines of this evolution in a slightly clearer and more significant light than they have hitherto enjoyed. Three factors are of outstanding importance. The first is the changing status of the leading companies producing the chief plays. The second is the shift of the chief royal patronage from companies of little or no share in the movement of the popular theatre to those having a large share. (We have long termed Shakspere's theatre the Elizabethan theatre, but no one has really shown the phrase to be a happy term rather than a gratuitous one.) In the third place, it is legitimate to see the long-rooted tendency of mankind to envisage its development in terms of decades as strikingly valid for interpretation of the Elizabethan theatre. Unique contributions of the fifties, sixties, seventies and eighties to the sixteenth-century English stage seem capable of a more strictly chronological summary than has commonly been admitted. Although this momentously dynamic period in the theatre is doubtless eclectic, highly diversified and irregular, it need not therefore be quite so confusing to the historian of drama, of ideas and of the temper of the times as it remains in many elaborate expositions. When critically considered, the Elizabethan stage gives evidence of the power of the stage to mirror human life,

and especially social problems, not only in Elizabethan England but in our world at large.

The development may be summarized by saying that relatively weak work and disparate forces combined to make a mighty force. Artistic expression remained comparatively weak so long as it voiced the culture of distinct social classes and institutions. It became strong as it dramatically converged to voice the culture of a united people. In 1550 theatrical entertainments in England addressed only limited classes. Although virtually all the people enjoyed some entertainment, no such truly communal entertainment as afforded in the times of Chaucer by the great Mystery Play cycles was available. Even the genial democratic temper in the plays of John Heywood, where all classes are levelled by farce, belongs to an earlier and more catholic age. For the old drama the Reformation spelled disintegration. Shakespeare began to write just as there again arose a communal theatre expressing the entire nation, uniting in a magic circle the taste and wisdom of the plebeian crowds, the public schools, the colleges, the law schools, aristocratic households, private circles of intellectuals, and the court itself.

Of course it is no simple matter to summarize a dramatic history where most of the plays remain utterly unknown today, where only a small fraction known by title survive in complete texts, and where records of performances and theatrical companies remain at best somewhat obscure. Nevertheless a summary may be reached which rather than violating the facts legitimately interprets them. The decade from 1540 to 1550 is a winter's sleep. The fifties disclose the rise of a new neo-classical comedy written in a racy vernacular, almost wholly under the auspices of schools and colleges. The sixties show a notable rise in neo-classical tragedy largely under the auspices or leadership of the Inns of Court. The seventies witness a surfeit of romantic plays on both medieval and classical themes produced for the court and by companies not notably engaged in popular entertainment as well. The eighties present the rise of the great Elizabethan drama: a drama rich in lyrical poetry, dramatic intrigue, and profound humanity, written by scholars leaning upon the humanist traditions of both schools and court, entertaining both a popular and a court or private audience, at

once racy and thoughtful, plebeian and aristocratic. The well organized popular companies begin to feed the court and private houses as well. The queen herself becomes patron of the first highly active company playing under both auspices. The popular theatres for the first time make their influences strongly felt. The court at first receives and then renounces the old-fashioned and class-conscious John Lyly as its leading entertainer; it prepares to receive and to patronize the new-fashioned and communally minded William Shakspere.

The development is especially clear during the first three of these four decades. We trace it both by focussing attention upon the chief plays representing true dramatic innovations, and by noting the titles of some of the much more numerous plays now lost. And we trace it especially by observing the auspices under which the plays were given.

We know that from at least the middle of the century plays designed chiefly to divert the populace, and even the provincial populace, were occasionally performed by companies under due patronage. The best example of this type of entertainment to come down to us is *Cambyses* (c. 1560). Its technical crudities and general naiveté indicate that its author had an eye upon a popular audience. Scholarly humanism touches the work but lightly. The general inexpertness of the play strongly suggests an amateurish authorship and a company no more than casually or superficially trained in the arts of the theatre. It betrays the degeneration into which the stage had fallen during the waning of the medieval tradition, when, year by year, the great Mystery dramas were meeting with neglect, decay and extinction. It scarcely hints at the new life that was just appearing or had already appeared a few years before *Cambyses* itself was performed. The play may possibly have had a court performance; it certainly in no way suggests a superior court culture.

Clearly a newly developed English comedy preceded a newly developed tragedy. It is no less clear that this comedy, based on Plautus and Terence, was performed chiefly in the schools and colleges, whence it occasionally found its way to court. While the Roman comic poets were probably

played in both Latin and English before 1550, it is doubtful if English plays to any serious degree modelled on them were given before 1550. During the decade of the fifties several such seem to have been performed, of which *Ralph Roister Doister*, probably given at Westminster School, and *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, originating at Christ's College, Cambridge, are, of course, the chief examples. Thus the new comedy was along slightly stiff and academic lines and largely for school consumption, and launched shortly before Elizabeth came to the throne.

The first decade of her reign was, considered in theatrical terms, a decade of tragedy. It seems likely that some Senecan plays had already been given in Latin and possibly even in English before the equivalent of a new tragedy in English was produced. The decade is significantly ushered in by the first of the celebrated series of English versions of Seneca, Jasper Heywood's *Thyestes* in 1560. Two years later the first known English tragedy in the humanist tradition, Sackville and Norton's *Gorboduc*, made its appearance, under the auspices of the Inner Temple. Four years later the Inner Temple witnessed the still more powerful *Gismund and Salerene*, written by five of its members. A survey of the plays produced during this decade shows how deeply the Senecan influence was felt and to what a large extent tragedy temporarily outdistanced all other forms for court performances and court reading. The remaining tragedies by Seneca were quickly translated. During the decade also appeared tragedies on the classical subjects of Dido, Darius, Appius and Virginia, and Massinissa, as well as a translation of Sophocles' *Ajax* into Latin and Gascoigne's version of Euripides by way of the Italian. So Elizabeth's reign commenced somewhat sternly so far as the advance of the drama was concerned. The chief contribution of the decade came unquestionably from the Inns of Court, where a considerable number of scholars betrayed serious dramatic interests and not unnotable gifts. And yet no great burst of dramatic energy is discernible. Professional actors are still given relatively slight support; they have no adequate homes for their plays. The theatrical instincts of the people as a whole remain inadequately tutored by learning or encouraged by the court, while the scholars and courtiers give, if possible, decreasing countenance to popular enter-

tainment. Humanism in England begins to wear a priggish air.

The seventies prove remarkable for a tendency seldom if ever noted by historians of the drama, a tendency which nevertheless swelled almost to the dimensions of a movement and has an eloquent and ironic place in theatrical evolution. The great Elizabethan drama of the last two decades of the century actually represents a revulsion from much that occurred during the seventies. The court, becoming increasingly affected and elegant, more and more sensitive to French, Italian and Spanish literatures and modes of thinking, from approximately 1570 to 1580 drew somewhat further away from the thought of the English people as a whole and commenced a vogue of chivalrous and distinctly aristocratic expression. Here we should, perhaps, extend the wave of taste slightly into the next decade, to include the first plays of John Lyly, whose *Euphues*, nevertheless, belongs to the close of the seventies. During these years, also, Sir Philip Sidney produced his pastoral mask, *The Lady of May* (1578), and wrote in his *Defense of Poesy* his austere, highly aristocratic and neoclassical comments upon the drama. These were banner years for the Children of the Chapel and for the Paul's Boys. Both in theory and practice the court was becoming rather more than less exclusive; there was no successful attempt to arrive at a national drama in place of a class drama, and as yet no strong evidence of social democracy in English taste.

The queen was invited to a series of plays artificial and romantic in tone, dealing indiscriminately with classical and chivalric themes and lacking native vitality. It is significant that only enough of these plays has survived to assure us of their general character—significant and rather fortunate, since they usually make poor reading. The two most representative of the ultra-romantic plays are *The Conflict of Conscience* and *Common Conditions*, the former published in 1581, the latter entered in the Stationer's Register for 1576 but both probably originating in the early seventies. The titles of many lost plays strongly suggest similar work, such as *Lady Barbara* (1571), *Ajax and Ulysses*, *Chariclea*, *Cloridon and Radiamanta*, *Narcissus*, and *Paris and Vienna* (1572), *Predor and Lucia* and *Mamillia* (1573),

Herpetulus the Blue Knight and Porobia, Panecia, Perseus and Andromeda, Phedrastus, Phignon and Lucia, Philemon and Filicia, Pretestus and Timoclea (1574), *The Painter's Daughter* and *The Red Knight* (1575), *Genocephals, The Irish Knight, The Solitary Knight* and *Titus and Gisippus* (1577), and *The Greek Maid* and *The Knight in the Burning Rock* (1579). These works, together with John Lyly's court comedies on mythological themes appearing in rapid succession early in the next decade, present a formidable sequence of romantic plays without either the true tang of comedy or the true depth of tragedy, and lacking any real contact with the thought and manners of the English people. More strongly than at any previous period in English history, the drama threatens to be divided into popular and undistinguished shows for the people, derivative and aristocratic drama for the court. Yet this court seems unfit to develop within itself the polish of the court drama elsewhere achieved in Europe.

The next few years, culminating with the emergence of Marlowe and Kyd in or about 1587 and of Shakspere some four years later, definitely set on its course the sudden outburst of England's true dramatic genius. Many suggestions have naturally been offered in explanation, none of which alone is or can be satisfactory. But perhaps no single statement can be more significant in this connection than the observation that, accompanying a number of developments in the status of the theatrical world itself, the British theatre abruptly ceased to be divided into a number of stages each reflecting a separate class or group in English life and became truly national. School and court had already effected a marriage as yet not conspicuously fruitful. Now the English public at large, especially in London, but to some extent throughout the land, was called upon to share this entertainment and to stimulate its growth. In the light of subsequent development, one of the most extraordinary features of the new theatrical world is the quiet period following the opening of the first public theatre in 1576 and 1577. The establishment of the Globe and Curtain does not seem at once to have rejuvenated the stage. No greatly increased number of plays is known to have been produced for the next four or five years, nor do the plays surviving from this period nor

anything known of the plays not extant nor of the performances themselves, make the great outburst of activity about 1587 seem more natural. The building of houses more fully equipped for theatrical performances than inn courts or royal halls was doubtless a gain; but not in itself a solution. New audiences, new playwrights, a well trained and more steadily employed company and above all a new social philosophy of drama were required. Historians of the theatre have pardonably exaggerated the importance of the building of the theatres and often missed the sociological importance of the establishment of the queen's company under Elizabeth's own patronage in 1583, playing in various houses. It is true that the companies under the patronage of various of Elizabeth's nobles played often at court. Yet a company under her own patronage, and organized with royal suffrage and in part certainly for royal entertainment, was a new and important advance. Its life was precarious; many of its actors passed shortly to the Admiral's Men or to the Chamberlain's, in other words, to the direction of Henslowe or Burbage. Nevertheless the seal of royal favor granted the popular English stage at the most critical period in its infancy seems one of the foremost signs of the times.

While history and tradition alike fail us in direct evidence, the presumption stands almost beyond doubt that both Elizabeth and her chief courtiers wearied of the diet of largely romantic plays to which they had been subjected throughout the years between 1570 and 1584-5. The courtly or romantic play, it seems, was not enough; it was not even headed in the right direction. The University plays in themselves were inadequate in warmth, fluidity and imagination. Marlowe came from the University to join his talents as an ardent humanist with the energies of the new, popular theatre. The outlook at both the Globe and the Curtain took an abrupt turn for the better.

At this juncture came with dramatic violence the long threatened struggle with Spain. War may create a military caste, but we well know today how often it furthers the cause of social democracy. Elizabeth is never seen in a more democratic light than when addressing her people at the training camp at Tilbury just before the victory over the Armada. This national triumph inevitably had strong reper-

cussions in the imaginative and theatrical life of the people. It unified the national spirit together with the national will. Moreover historians of the drama too often fail to recall that in her democratic outlook and sincere love of her people Elizabeth inherited the Tudor as distinct from the Stuart outlook. She was not so much of an aesthete as Charles nor so much of a pedant as James; she seems to have witnessed far fewer plays than they and to have attended more diligently to the affairs of state. Yet her philosophy of the stage was indubitably sounder than theirs. The company which she patronized performed at the Red Bull Inn the first true chronicle history play to come down to us and probably one of the first to be written, *The Famous Victories of Henry V* (1586), which is universally remembered as the first play based upon Holinshed and the direct source for much of Shakspere's concluding trilogy in his English historical dramas. Here for the first time appeared the figures later to be transformed into Falstaff and his followers. The plausible tradition of Elizabeth's later association with Falstaff is too well known to require mention, though its wider significance may often have been missed. The court and people alike must at once have felt the force of the chronicle history plays in uniting the nation and inspiring it with patriotic fervor. True poetry first came to the English stage with the historical play *Tamburlaine*; the intrigues of statecraft first became the intrigues of drama in *The Spanish Tragedy*. No group of plays rivalled the chronicle histories themselves in confirming the greatness of either the young Shakspere or the growing Elizabethan drama as a whole. Court and populace alike found here a common theme for plays, and companies playing in the popular theatres discovered a lively technique worthy of both the patriotic theme and themes far greater and more nearly universal.

At approximately 1580 two forces seriously competed for possession of the English drama, both relying on the court for patronage and for protection against the otherwise irresistible Puritan opposition. These forces were the romantic or courtly drama so popular in the seventies and the new national drama so abruptly popular in the eighties. Lyly makes great advances over his predecessors in polite romantic comedy but actually represents the older school. His Euphuism is a courtly affectation; his themes and ideas are

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

those of the school comedy inherited from the days of Udall; his actors are the oldest established company in the kingdom, the Paul's Boys, and the similar though younger company under the Earl of Oxford. Lyly, long ardently and pathetically aspired to royal favor and to the post of Master of Revels, from which he would have been in a position to exercise a considerable if not actually a guiding hand over London's entertainment. He failed in all his personal ambitions. Brilliant as his dramatic successes at first must have seemed, their power to dazzle was short-lived. By 1583 the initiative in the English drama definitely passed from the more courtly companies to the more popular ones. The courtly school offered a rather pale romantic comedy but no really robust comedy or native tragedy. On the other hand the popular theatre had these more substantial plays, a great tragic actor in Alleyn and a great comic actor in Tarlton. Henceforth the children were always to play a second fiddle and, despite Hamlet's fears, to continue as the apes and followers of their betters. The public play-houses always kept a little in advance of the new private play-houses, where the rich or even royalty itself might go for entertainment. They became the great dramatic laboratories of the kingdom. The most relished performance at court and the most frequently given were the offspring of the popular theatres.

The English stage reflects English life not only in its democratic genius for achieving a common meeting place for all classes of the community but in maintaining a state of illogical compromise. Throughout the last years of Elizabeth's reign a few performances were, of course, given at court and some plays written that might have appeared without any of the ferment of the popular dramatic movement. The Stuarts barely ascended the throne before there began to creep back the exclusive, aristocratic drama that once threatened to dominate even the court of Elizabeth. But so strong was the national spirit created by the decade of the Armada and the quiet patronage of Elizabeth, that the dominant note for the first seven or eight years of James's reign remained still national. Then, with the retirement of Shakspere and the ascendancy of Beaumont and Fletcher, the cavalier drama came into the ascendancy. The city and

the nation lost command of the stage. Continental influences again ruled without serious check from the native genius. A narrowly aristocratic taste won the day; and the very forces that had clearly yielded the field by 1586 returned to triumph by approximately 1616.

In small things we see the images of mighty ones; and just as the infinitely human stage mirrors the national life, so a single playwright, hardly himself a commanding genius, faithfully mirrors the turn of the tide. George Peele enjoyed a longer career as playwright than Marlowe, Kyd, or Greene, and hence best epitomizes the change. His *Arraignment of Paris*, produced in December 1581, is a graceful pastoral play in the courtly or Sidnean manner, given at court by the Children of the Chapel. It is a more refined and elegant drama than John Heywood's relatively homely *Play of the Weather*, but even if Peele's rhetoric is more extreme, his basic conception is as trivial as that in Heywood's interlude, presumably given under analogous auspices. Peele did not mold his age; he was molded by it. The same year—1587—that witnessed Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* witnessed Peele's *David and Betsabe*, a poetic play on biblical history treated in the technique of the English chronicle histories so much loved by the popular audiences. All Peele's later plays were presumably written for the popular companies, his association so far as is known being confined to the Queen's Men, the Admiral's Men, and Strange's. For these companies he wrote in Marlowe's eclectic vein, both as scholar and as popular playwright. His material might equally serve the newly democratic taste of the court or the eager palate of the vulgar. His mature plays are conspicuous for lively poetry, stirring intrigues, and national fervor. It is a far cry from his *Arraignment of Paris* to his *Edward I.* In *The Old Wife's Tale* (c. 1590), he writes with keen appreciation of folklore and with a sophisticated irony pleasing, no doubt, to the educated but turned against the very type of romancing received with favor at court ten years before.

Shakspere is wholly of the new age. If he writes a Senecan tragedy of revenge, it is British no less than Senecan; if he writes a romantic comedy, it is English no less than romantic. That Shakspere addresses all social classes and levels of intelligence is as clearly true of Elizabethan times as for

any subsequent age. Ben Jonson asserts the same ideal in his prologue to *The Silent Woman*, where he declares that his comedy aims to please all types and classes of people who may attend it. The scholar and friend of the courtiers is friend also of the people. The synthesis achieved in so large a measure through the rise of popular companies under noble or royal patronage—companies offering the same play and same cast on the Bankside and at Westminister—attains with Shakspere and Jonson its brief but undying splendor.

The democratic viewpoint was won after three decades of experiment with a theatre far short of a national ideal. A wise ruler, who knew her people, an aristocracy willing to harken to the people and a people eager to learn from an aristocracy, together with a national crisis, welded a whole nation together. During the fifties the drama of the public schools introduced a classical conception of form. During the sixties "the learned lawyers" introduced serious ideas and serious emotional expression. During the seventies the court introduced cosmopolitan refinement. And, finally, in the eighties the popular theatres added to these the vitality of the whole people and assimilated whatever had gone before. With the new plays all classes combined both in the audience and in the substance of the drama itself. England's scholars ceased to be mere pedants, its populace ceased to be mere boors. Humanity triumphed in life and on the stage as, under like circumstances, it must triumph yet again. For the greatest dramatic movements resemble the great religious movements in being communal, catholic, and classless. So it was in Athens; so under Elizabeth; and so it may yet be in the vast democracies of the twentieth century. Shakspere's theatre affords the most striking of all object lessons in a genuine social democracy, where neither rich nor poor tyrannize over their rivals but unite to a single end.

Columbia University, New York City.

SPENSER'S 'WRENOCK'

By LOUIS S. FRIEDLAND

The passage of the December Eclogue of the *Shepheardes Calendar* to which I invite attention reads:

And for I was in th̄ke same looser yeares,
(Whether the Muse so wrought me from my birth,
Or I to much beleived my shepherd peres,)
Somedele ybent to song and musicks mirth,
A good olde shephearde, Wrenock was his name,
Made me by arte more cunning in the same. (ll. 37-42)¹

Who is Wrenock? A number of identifications have been suggested, each of which has found a degree of acceptance among a group of scholars: (1) Wrenock represents not a person but a personification of Pembroke Hall, "the little wren" (wren-ock) among the Cambridge colleges; (2) Wrenock is Jan Van der Noot, the Dutch author of the *Theatre for Worldlings* (1569), an emblem-book in English translation, to which Spenser contributed his unrhymed versions of sonnets by DuBellay and Petrarch (from Marot's French translation); (3) Wrenock is Richard Mulcaster, headmaster of the Merchant Taylors School; (4) Wrenock is a conversion or anagram of the name, Clément Marot, whose *Eglogue au roy soubz les noms de Pan et de Robin* (1539) Spenser freely adapted to make his December Eclogue.

The first of these guesses was made by Reverend A. B. Grosart and adopted by J. J. Higginson² and others. Grosart writes: "Could it be a personification of his college, 'Pembroke', spelled 'Penbroke,' which, compared with the greater colleges, was 'Wrenock,' a little wren? At Pembroke he cultured his poetical powers, following up the Sonnets of the *Theatre for Worldlings*; so, in a sense, his College, in the personification of a shepherd named Wrenock, may be credited as in these lines, and especially l. 6, 'Made me by arte more cunning in the same.'"³

A plausible view, on the surface. Unfortunately, Grosart quotes no authority for his belief that Pembroke Hall was ever known or referred to as "the wren" among Cambridge seats of learning. An examination of all the material avail-

able to me dealing with the University and Pembroke College failed to reveal a single reference to bear out Grossart's contention; nor have I come upon such an allusion in my reading in sixteenth-century English literature. The conjecture may be dismissed as wholly without foundation, on the basis of a statement by the President and Acting Librarian of Pembroke College, Mr. Ellis H. Minns, kindly sent me in reply to my query: "I have never heard of Pembroke being called the wren among Cambridge Colleges. Of course in Spenser's time it would be a very small place as a building but not smaller than Catherine or Trinity Hall or perhaps Peterhouse or Magdalene. By a curious coincidence, perhaps the most prominent member of the college from 1605-1626 or so was the very small Matthew Wren, and if the phrase had been current in the generation before I think it would have been revived for his time and we should know of it."¹⁴

The interpretation of 'Wrenock' as 'little wren' is questionable, especially in connection with "a good olde shepherd." So far as I can discover, the figurative use of 'wren' in contemporary writings was intended to apply to young females; for example, Sir Toby in *Twelfth Night*, pointing to Maria, declares: "Look where the youngest wren of nine comes." Today we have come to admire the Wrens in an embattled England. It is doubtful, too, that Spenser would have thought of his College or his University ("My mother Cambridge") under the guise of "an olde shepherd."

Equally without merit is the suggestion that Spenser's Wrenock stands for Van der Noot. No evidence exists to prove that Spenser had ever met the Dutch poet. The translated 'Sonets' and 'Epigrams' in the *Theatre for Worldlings* could have been furnished by Spenser at the request of Henry Bynneman, publisher of this volume as of the pamphlet containing the exchange of letters between Spenser and Gabriel Harvey. The view that the young poet turned for schooling in versecraft to a Dutch émigré ignorant of the English language is too absurd for serious discussion, yet, relying on the free-for-all practice of anagram-making, several commentators have derived the word 'Wrenock' from Van der Noot. I am put in mind of one

of my college professors of French who humorously demonstrated the relation between the English 'bishop' and the French 'évoque'. "The *é* was changed to *bi* and *vogue* became *shop*—and there you have it!"

A similar reliance on anagram-hunting does much to weaken the otherwise plausible case of those who hold that Wrenock is none other than Richard Mulcaster. True enough, they have the support of Spenser's practice in the *Shephearde's Calendar*, where Grindal becomes *Algrind* and Aylmer, *Morrell*; but the same poem provides us with non-anagrammatic masquing of proper names, *e. g.*, *Roffy* for John Young, *Hobbinol* for Gabriel Harvey, *Colin* (derived from Marot and Skelton) for Spenser himself, and so on. In other words, Spenser makes use of numerous devices for disguising his pastoral characters: anagrams, a vague assonance, a more or less familiar association or attribute (*Roffiensis*, for instance), or a name hallowed in the pastoral tradition (*Colin*, *Tityrus*, etc.), not to mention several forms of disguise which we have not penetrated. Outside the rare use of an established classical name, the attempt is to endow the invented term with a rustic cast, for the sake of pastoral decorum. For these reasons it is possible to maintain with W. L. Renwick that "the name [Wrenock] is perhaps a perversion of the initials R. M."⁵ or of 'Richard', that is, Richard Mulcaster, though a more elaborate searching of the letters of this educator's name seems to me an unwarranted and profitless straining for proof. Such an elaboration is undertaken by G. C. Moore Smith: "It appears that to those who knew him Mulcaster's name took different forms . . . It is at least an interesting coincidence that, if the name be taken as 'Mouncaster', it yields the anagram 'Mast. Vrenoc,' and if 'Mowncaster,' 'Mast. Wrenoc.'⁶ I am inclined to consider all this far-fetched. A sufficient basis for belief that Spenser had this "old shepherd" in mind in his December Eclogue is furnished by our knowledge of the relationship of teacher and pupil between the two, and by the fact that, as Mr. Renwick expresses it, "The works of this notable personality are evidence that he held such views as would influence a pupil in the direction Spenser took."⁷ That Spenser adapted the

word 'Wrenock' from the letters of Mulcaster's name is by no means so clear, nor, as we have seen, is it necessary to believe that in creating the rustic name, Wrenock, Spenser remembered that Mulcaster was from the North-Country, from Cumberland.⁸

Those who hold that Wrenock is an inversion of the poet's name, Marot, enjoy the merit of connecting the "shepherd" with the author of the poem which Spenser 'translates' into the December Eclogue. There is logic and probability in this view. It was first suggested by F. T. Palgrave in these words: 'In this stanza, corresponding to Spenser's seventh, Marot traces his own early attempts in poetry to the influence of his father, Jean; whose lessons are described at much greater length than Spenser has bestowed upon his own relations with Wrenock;—an unidentified name which, perhaps, is only inserted as a paraphrase of Marot.'⁹ Spenser's frequent borrowings from Marot hardly need demonstration; despite E. K.'s belittling reference to Marot,¹⁰ with which Spenser could hardly have been expected to agree, the scholiast is unable to avoid an occasional mention of the indebtedness which, though much less in degree, is not unlike that freely confessed by Spenser of his Tityrus, Chaucer:

The god of Shepheards, Tityrus, is dead
Who taught me, homely as I can, to make.¹¹

As Lois B. Borland has shown in her close study¹² of the December Eclogue and Marot's *Eglogue au Roy*, very few problems in the former can be adequately treated without relation to the French poem. Perhaps Wrenock is a "paraphrase", in rustic-sounding English syllables, of Marot's "le bon Janot, mon père," and "Jacquet son compère," which the marginal glosses in the early editions of the French eclogue interpret: *Jean Marot*, and *Jacques Colin*, poets after a fashion in their day. In the brief phrase, "Made me by arte more cunning in the same," Spenser sums up a long passage in which Clément Marot describes his father's tuition in versecraft, hinting, it may be, of how much he had learned of the poetic art while translating the verses of one of his favorite 'makers'.

In any case, we are vouchsafed no more than a vague hint as to the identity of Wrenock. Who shall say with confidence the name, or names, that passed through Spenser's mind as he penned the lines of the stanza we are considering? Marot, Richard Mulcaster, Chaucer? . . . Perhaps a patron who made it possible for him to acquire the 'art'? And if so, what patron more fitting than Lord Grey of Wilton? I shall say nothing about the anagrammatic suitability of the name. Let us recall, instead, the opening lines of the *Faerie Queene* Dedicatory Sonnet "To the Lord Grey of Wilton":

Most noble Lord, the pillar of my life,
And patron of my Muses pupillage,
Through whose large bountie, poured on me rite,
In the first season of my feeble age,
I now do live, bound yours by vassalage

If these words, so warm and frank, so different in tone from the mellifluous but perfunctory laudation of most of the other Dedicatory Sonnets prefaced to the *Faerie Queene*,¹³ have any meaning, they express unmistakably Spenser's sense of gratitude to Lord Grey of Wilton, "patrone of my Muses pupillage." Surely they indicate that Arthur Grey's assistance of the poet began long before the appointment to the secretaryship in Ireland. It has now been demonstrated that Leicester had no hand in this appointment; it appears doubtful, too, that the Sidneys found it necessary to employ their good offices in order to win for Spenser the coveted post. Why not adopt the plain implication of Spenser's own statement: that Lord Grey had been his patron from the very start?

Even if this were only a supposition it would still be altogether consistent with our knowledge of Arthur Lord Grey as a helper of poets: George Gascoigne and George Turberville, among others.¹⁴ As J. P. Collier puts it, "In fact, Grey seems always to have had some eminent poet in his retinue."¹⁵ We know of Spenser's indebtedness to Gascoigne—the recipient of one of E. K.'s left-handed compliments—in the *Shepherd's Calendar* and elsewhere, especially to *The Complaynt of Phyloemene*, dedicated April, 1575, to Lord Grey, and to *The Steel Glass*, consigned to

the same patron, April 15, 1576, and both published by Henry Bynneman. That Grey was at times intimately associated with Cambridge affairs is equally well established.¹⁶ I cannot take occasion here to pursue the theme of Spenser's relations with Lord Grey and the group of poets whom Grey took under his wing. It is a theme that deserves more ample treatment than has hitherto been accorded it. Let it suffice to recall the illuminating passage from John Marston's elegy on the sad end of Arthur Grey's son, Thomas, written in 1614:¹⁷

O could his Father's Genius leave the Grave
And reassume the Facultys wee have,
What surfeit of content might he display
In viewing Him, and in him see dead Gray,
Long since inter'd, reviv'd. For Arthur's Sonn
Holds Arthurs spiritt, though his corps bee doun.
And what divinest Spener er'st foretold
Finish'd in him his eies should cleere beholde,
Where faire discretion, mixt with dauntless heart,
Sownds loud his prowes and proclaymes his Art
Whose Infant Muse succor'd by thy faire wing
Had leave to thrive, and thriving learn'd to sing
With voice Propheticke in those ruder parts
Thy selfe sole Patron both of Arms and Artes.

In the shadowy form of the shepherd Wrenock one may be pardoned for recognizing some of the features of Arthur Grey of Wilton, to be transformed later to the nobler guise of Artegall.

The names of Spenser's shepherds reappear in many a pastoral poem made in imitation of those in the *Shephearde's Calendar*: Colin, Thenot, Cuddy, and the rest. Wrenock alone was ignored. I discover the name but once, in the *Eclogue: Concerning olde Age* that survives in part in Francis Davison's *A Poetical Rhapsody*, 1602.¹⁸ It is a pastoral dialogue, palpably Spenserian, between Perin and Wrenock,¹⁹ but it throws no light on our problem.

Perhaps the problem is insoluble. Very likely it is wisest to say, with the cautious and scholarly C. H. Herford, "Who Wrenock was is quite unknown."²⁰ But we will say this only because we believe that Spenser, always ready to acknowledge literary indebtedness, had no one in mind

when he spoke of the old shepherd who made him by art
more cunning in the craft of poesy.

New York.

¹In Theodore Bathurst's Latin version of the *Calendar* the last two lines read: *Longaeus pastor, cui nomen Titurus, artem / Edocuit, etc.* *Works of Edmund Spenser*, London, 1689, p. 390.

²*Spenser's Shepherd's Calendar in Relation to Contemporary Affairs*, N. Y., 1912, p. 164, n. 7.

³*The Complete Works of Edmund Spenser*, I. 46 n.

⁴Another Cambridge man whose low stature would have warranted the figurative term, "wren", was Richard Greenham, who preached occasionally at St. Mary's during Spenser's years at the University. The diminutive figure of this well-known divine is mentioned in the *DNB* biographical sketch. Although his name offers the letters for a perfect anagram for "Wrenock", we have nothing to establish the fact of his acquaintance with Spenser or his interest in poetry.

⁵*Edition of Shephearde's Calendar*. London, 1930, p. 228.

⁶*MLR*, VII (1913), 368.

⁷*Op. cit.*, p. 228.

⁸Muncaster, now Muncaster, is a parish in county Cumberland; the change is illustrated in *baluster* and *banister*. The name Muncaster, anciently Moelcastre, is a combination of Old Norse and Latin (*mel-r*, a sandbank or sandhill, and *castra*, a camp). Muncaster Castle is situated at Esk-Meol, near the mouth of the River Esk. See, Henry Harrison, *Surnames of the British Kingdom*, London, 1918, II. 32.

⁹"Essays on the Minor Poems of Spenser," in Grosart's edition of the *Works*, IV, lix.

¹⁰"The French poete Marot (if he be worthy of the name of a poete)". First gloss to the January Elogue.

¹¹June Elogue, II. 81-82.

¹²*The Influence of Marot on English Poetry of the 16th Century*, MS Thesis, University of Chicago, 1913.

¹³The Sonnet addressed to Lord Grey was in the first group, not dutifully added at a later time. Among Spenser's sonnets dedicated to individuals, sixteen in all (the seventeenth is inscribed to the Ladies of the Court), very few bear a personal or intimate note; of these few the one to Grey takes first place in respect of the qualities mentioned. The Sonnet to Raleigh implies a degree of intimate literary acquaintance; that to Buckhurst is formal in tone, a tribute to a noble poet not personally known to Spenser; a warmer touch of relationship of a personal nature comes, in the Sonnet to the Countess of Pembroke, with the allusion to Philip Sidney: "Who first my Muse did lift out of the flore, To sing his sweet delights in lowlie layes." All the other Dedicatory Sonnets are impersonal, the usual laudations of the great and powerful.

¹⁴J. J. Higginson, *op. cit.*, pp. 326 ff., who points out (pp. 334 ff.) the connection that probably existed between Grey's family and that of Sir John Spencer of Althorpe, father of Lady Carey, Lady Compton, and Lady Strange. C. T. Prouty, *George Gascoigne*, N. Y., 1942, Index under Arthur Grey of Wilton—relations with Gascoigne and Turberville. *DNB sub Grey, Gascoigne, and Turberville*.

¹⁵*Edition of Spenser's Works*, London, 1862, I. xlvi, n. Sir S. E. Brydges, *Restituta*, London, 1815, III. 347-49, Grey and Spenser.

¹⁶J. J. Higginson, *op. cit.*, p. 333. *The Spending of the Money of Robert Nowell, The Townley Hall MSS.* Ed., A. B. Grosart, London, 1877, p. 208.

¹⁷*An elegiacal poem on the death of Thomas Lord Grey of Wilton*. Roxburghe Club, London, 1822, XXXIII. S. E. Brydges, *op. cit.*, IV. 343-46.

¹⁸Edited by Hyder E. Rollins, I. 50-53. The opening and closing stanzas are lacking.

¹⁹By a slip, perhaps due to the printer, Perin addresses Wrenock as Thenot in the last stanza.

²⁰*Edition of the Shephearde's Calender*, p. 189.

“AND CURST BE HE’

Calm and still in the evening air
The pointed spire cleaves the sky—
(*Good frend for Jesus' sake forbeare*—
The hum of airplanes from on high
Sends a dread warning . . . It comes nigh—
The moonlight full on the churchyard clear—
The planes drone —thunder—swoop—sweep by
(*To digg the dust encloasèd heare*—
Crash! on the graves the bombs explode—
The earth heaves dully—great holes gape—
(*Bleste be y^e man y^t spares thes stones*—
Night offers but a shifting road
As the grim raiders seek escape—
(*And curst be he y^t moves my bones.*)

ROBERT WITTINGTON,
Northampton, Massachusetts

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NILSON

VOL. XVIII

APRIL, 1943

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Humanism in Shakspere's Works	<i>Prof. M. M. Morozov</i> 51
Teaching the Shaksperian Drama	<i>Clyde F. Lytle</i> 62
Shakspere's Stage Business	<i>Samuel A. Small</i> 66
Magic—Of An Age and For All Time	<i>Claire McGlinchee</i> 72
Shakspere And <i>Sir Thomas Moore</i>	<i>Paul Deutschberger</i> 75
Much Ado About Something	<i>George C. Taylor</i> 92
Editorial Comment—An Important New Book	<i>S. A. T.</i> 95

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary
Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

HUMANISM IN SHAKSPERE'S WORKS*

BY PROFESSOR M. M. MOROZOV

TODAY we are opening our fourth Shakspere conference. The first occurred in 1939. We were then discussing the achievements of the past, the milestones left behind by the Soviet theater in producing Shakspere. The conference of 1940 was devoted to the problems of translating Shakspere into Russian; and that of last year pointed out the perspectives of the future Soviet theater in producing Shakspere.

At this conference we speak of the present, of the connection between Shakspere's genius and the world of today. We feel that the great humanist is with us in this titanic struggle against fascist man-haters. But having accepted Shakspere as our contemporary, we must study him for the future as well. Perhaps today we may be able to see more clearly those fundamental matters in Shakspere's works which will later serve us as guiding stars in the practical and creative work of our theaters. This is why I chose for my subject today Shakspere's humanism. Shakspere's genius not only produced a galaxy of remarkable characters, his works are a plea for humanism. No matter what attitude or point of view we take in approaching his works, we invariably find in them the humanitarian attitude.

An attentive reader of Shakspere will note that two concepts, two basic themes, are constantly repeated by him—"cloak and nature" (appearance and reality). These ideas or themes are always placed in juxtaposition. Even in his youthful comedy, *The Taming of the Shrew*, it is easy to see these clearly identified themes in the characters of Katherine and Bianca.

Katherine is a self-willed shrew. But this is not her nature. It is her fancy, her exterior, her humor—her "cloak". As the play progresses she throws off this exterior and emerges as a tender, yielding character—the shrewish cloak is off.

Alongside of Katherine her sister Bianca is vivacious, sympathetic, good. But, the marriage is hardly over when

*A speech delivered at the Shakspere Conference in Moscow in April, 1942. Translated by Eugene Blum.

she shows her claws and calls her husband a fool in the presence of others. Her gentleness and modesty were only the cloak which concealed a different nature. This is an earlier work but even here Shakspere points to the difference between "cloak and substance" in the contrast between Katherine and Bianca. It is interesting that in the original of this play (not by Shakspere) Bianca is absent. Shakspere introduces her to underline the contradiction. This point is also brought out in Petruchio's monologue when he says:

"What! is the jay more precious than the lark
Because his feathers are more beautiful?
Or is the adder better than the eel
Because his painted skin contents the eye?"

This point has not been sufficiently emphasized in our productions of *The Taming*. Even the excellent staging in the theater of the Red Army omitted this monologue, so important in the conception of the play. This applies to the entire symbolism of the comedy. We must go deeper into Shakspere's symbolism. Why does Petruchio take away Katherine's gorgeous raiment? Because this brings out the basic idea of the play: the cloak and the substance. Why does Petruchio appear in rags at his wedding? Because Katherine is marrying him, not his clothes. Shakspere's works are rich in this kind of symbolism, even though, to our regret, it is being overlooked even in the best of our productions.

If we follow Shakspere in the development of this theme carefully, we will discover that the same idea is carried over to the social plane. Nobility, for instance, is just a matter of clothes. In *The Winter's Tale*, for instance, when, at the end of the fifth act, the shepherd and his simple son (the clown) become gentlemen, they insist that their children will be "gentlemen born". Says the clown:

"See you these clothes? Say you see them not,
and think me still no gentleman born."

But the basic development of the theme "nature *verus* cloak", as we call it, received its ultimate expression in the tragedies, above all in the clash between black Othello and "honest" Iago. Roderigo calls Othello thick-lipped. Brabantio is not only indignant, he is amazed, that Desdemona could choosse as her husband such a "vile thing".

According to Shakspere's plot, Othello is not handsome. Desdemona says: "I saw Othello's visage in his mind." But Desdemona does not apologize for his exterior. The crux of the matter is that this black and ugly Othello is a singular man, and the seemingly honest Iago proves to be a scoundrel. And this again is a motif which, in my opinion, has not been stressed sufficiently on the stage. I admire the acting of Ostoozshev in *Othello*, yet, when I see him on the stage, I find him too handsome and interesting and not in agreement with Shakspere's plan.

Observing Iago on the stage, it often becomes obvious that he is a villain, yet no one about him notices it. This is revealed gradually by the course of events: the masque falls, down come the cloaks and the nature of man stands revealed.

A book written by Delia Bacon, which denies Shakspere's authorship of the plays, contains a strikingly deep observation about the inner substance of Shakspere's works. Discussing the major tragedies, Miss Bacon calls them "philosophic stripplings." King Lear sheds his royal vestments—the Olympian descends upon the earth. He comes down to earth. What a miserable creature the naked two legged animal is! This terrible fall is at the same time a grand triumph. The king is reborn into a man. His clothes are off, his human nature is revealed. Here again we see the important theme which has its deep roots in the human soul.

On the philosophic plane too we find the juxtaposition of name and substance. Remarkable in this respect is Juliet's monologue, when she speaks of the rose:

"What's in a name? That which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet."

In other words, the importance is not in the name but in the substance. Juliet continues:

"What is Montague? It is nor hand, nor foot,
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
Belonging to a man."

So in *Hamlet*, when the Queen asks:

"Why seems it so particular with thee?"

Hamlet answers:

"Seems, madam! 'Nay it is!
I know not 'seems'."

This basic theme contributes largely to making Shakspere's works what they are: challenging, revealing. Shakspere becomes the accuser. He takes off the masques, tears off the cloaks, and shows us man as he really is, not as he pretends to be. In the light of present events, this challenging power of Shakspere is extremely important, because you and I, who lived through and are going through so much now, have witnessed shocking deeds in a world-tragedy created by the fascists. Think of the peaceful declarations of the monster Hitler? When they turned to bloody practice of fascism, there appeared in our press a comparison between fascism and the two faced Janus. (Incidentally, in *Othello* Iago swears by Janus.)

Shakspere, the revealer, is very dear to us today.

Speaking of Shakspere's humanism, of the positive content of his works, it seems to me extremely important to point out his attitude to man. The name "man," in the Shakspelian sense, is the highest praise he can give to any character.

When Antony says of Brutus, his enemy, "He was a man," the words sound like great commendation. When he is speaking of Hamlet's father, Horatio says to Hamlet:

"I saw him once; he was a goodly king."

Hamlet replies: "He was a man." It is not important that he was a king and a goodly king, but it is important that he was a man.

Shakspere's works of the first period are characterized by absolute faith in the nobility of human nature, and this explains the optimistic trend of these works. Of course, there are deviations from the norm. Villainy exists as a deviation from the norm. Richard III is cursed from childhood by deformity and ugliness. The villain of *Much Ado*, Don John, is an illegitimate child, which puts him into the unusual position. But those are deviations from the norm. Altogether, Shakspere's works of that period represent a festival of human optimism.

In the second period, in the major tragedies, there appears the conflict; the struggle between the humanists and, as they were known in England at the time, the Machiavellians, people who were willing to sacrifice everything for personal

gain. They were quite in evidence during the epoch of "primary accumulation."

Hence the difference in spirit in the works of the second period,—its cleavage, its dualism: on one hand the avowal of man's greatness; on the other disillusionment in man.

"What a piece of work is man" and

"Man delights not me,"

says Hamlet in the same monologue.

Rather typical for this period is the conversation of two fisherman in *Pericles*:

"I marvel how the fishes live in the sea," muses one.

"Why as men do a-land; the great ones eat the little ones,"

philosophizes the other.

Shakspere, and not he alone, but Marlowe before him, and many of his contemporaries, saw this fearful strife about them, saw what Apemantus, the philosopher in *Timon*, characterizes as a forest inhabited by wild beasts. But the entire problem is this: does Shakspere consider this strife, which he observes around him, as something eternal, as the essential part of life? Basically, it seems to me, what makes Shakspere's tragedies tragic and not pessimistic is the fact that he considers evil as something transitory. Think of the appalling event in *Romeo and Juliet*: the lovers perish, but the reconciliation of the Montagues and the Capulets takes place, erecting a golden monument to the heroes at the end. Every tragedy of his, every great work, must be accepted as a reflection of his world viewpoint. At the end of his tragedies we invariably find an optimistic attitude: the strife lessens, enlightenment ensues. Even in *King Lear*, despite the horrible events, this optimistic note is expressed in the fact that noble Edgar and Kent ascend to power.

Our theaters do not bring this out. Not only in the provinces, but in the metropolitan centers as well. They omit, for instance, the reconciliation scene in *Romeo and Juliet*. At a performance of *King Lear*, which I saw not long ago in the provinces, the director left out the finale where Edgar and Kent become the rulers of the State.

Dying Hamlet begs Horatio: "Tell my story." He speaks of the future. When A. V. Poliakov played the part last year in a truly remarkable production in Voronezsh (it was given

fifty times to sold-out houses) and uttered these words, his face was illumined and one felt that he was looking far ahead, saw the end of the strife and evil which destroyed him, and made a tremendous impression.

Hamlet himself finds that life is dislocated and that this dislocation must be set right. Thus Hamlet believes in the possibility of rectification. But the Machiavellian Iago thinks strife an eternal necessity. He sees life at all times as a struggle of beasts, as a contest among men. This is his philosophy, which he exposes in detail before Roderigo. When we analyse the tragedies of Shakspere, we feel how extremely close they are to our times. They are a complete repudiation and denial of all pronouncements and harangues of fascists and Hitler, who insist that life is war and that war is a permanent institution, an eternal part of life. Even when the tragic theme reaches its culmination in *Timon*, where we read that the heart of mankind is made of iron and where Timon exclaims that he is a misanthrope and hates mankind, even here the humanitarian note is not lost, if we recall that the bandit, listening to Timon's tirades, is ready to give up his trade. This is an important detail of the play. Those are not simple monologues of hatred, far from it. Evidently, in their irony, in the satire, there lurks the humanitarian content which converts a criminal into an honest man.

In his last work, *The Tempest*, Shakspere found a way out from the tragic. It seems to me, this play deserves more attention than it has received. To begin with, our translations of it are poor. If it were possible to translate it into Russian in a way that the whole content could be revealed, we would find in it not only an important work, but a play which has a particular meaning in the creative work of the author, as the crowning of his life's work.

In *The Tempest* Shakspere turns into the realm of allegoric art. Prospero, whose name is derived from the verb "to prosper," is the embodiment of prospering humanity; the goal of humanity to come, humanity which has conquered the dark forces of nature, as represented by Caliban, and the bright benign forces, as represented by Ariel. He is the embodiment of mankind, able to read its destiny; mankind able to call up the image of Ceres, at the wave of the magic wand, and receive her gifts of the fruits of the soil.

Miranda says: "How beauteous mankind is." The great contest which Shakspere's genius reflects culminates in the hymn to humanity.

In the same play, through the image of Prospero, the theme of the greatness of human wisdom is developed. Prospero—the sage is the glorification of science and the glorification of human intelligence, the ideals for which civilized man is now warring.

Let us recall, in passing, the scene in *Pericles* where the physician resurrects the dead. This theme in Shakspere's interpretation sounds somewhat naive now, yet it speaks of his profound faith in the intellect, in science. In the play the physician says that science is a greater gift than wealth and noble birth.

Extremely interesting is Shakspere's approach to the problem of destiny. The idea of fate as a mystic concept is totally absent in Shakspere's works. Destiny to him is the sum total of external circumstances or external influences. In this light destiny in *Romeo and Juliet* lies in the strife between the Montagues and the Capulets. Juliet had opportunities to avoid this destiny: had she listened to her nurse and married the handsome Paris, rejecting Romeo, she would have escaped death. But she voluntarily and consciously went her own way. Romeo and Juliet were doomed when they entered the feud in the world of the Montagues and Capulets. Thus the concept of destiny contains nothing mysterious.

Let me direct attention to *Macbeth* in this connection. Many believed that Macbeth was a pawn in the hands of fate and that he was forced into crime by the witches, the impersonators of fate. But the thought of killing Duncan came to Macbeth long before the "witches" appeared. Says Lady Macbeth to her husband: "What Beast was't then that made you break this enterprize to me?" And again: "Nor time, nor place did then adhere, and yet you would make both." Obviously, they are referring to a time when Macbeth spoke of killing Duncan, a moment which occurred long before he met the weird sisters. The initiative for the crime came from Macbeth, not from them. Macbeth killed Duncan not because they had come into his life; they came because he wanted to kill Duncan.

In this most fatalistic of Shakspere's plays we see that their destiny is being made by the persons themselves. The basic strength of Shakspere's genius lies in this. Shakspere's theory of fate is diametrically opposed to the philosophy of fascists who preach obedience to destiny. This explains their negative attitude to Shakspere: while they accept his comedies as spectacles for entertainment, they reject his more serious works. The philosophy of fate, as expressed by the fascists means that every one must obey blindly and without criticism.

Probing into Shakspere's world-philosophy, we find in every detail of his convictions a direct contradiction to the credo and practice of inhuman fascism. To take just one example: their subjugation of women.

If we should look for any exhibition of this theme in Shakspere, we may find something in his early works; for instance, in *The Comedy of Errors*, in the conversation between Adriana and Luciana, the view is expressed that woman by her nature must be obedient; in *The Taming of the Shrew*, where Katherine in the end appears as a pattern of obedience. This, evidently, was a concession to his epoch, which, beginning with *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, he later gave up. In his later plays the heroic images of his women revealed themselves more and more. Think of Desdemona. Othello calls her "my fair warrior" when she appears before him in Cyprus. Desdemona is not a faint shadow, as she is often presented on the stage. Shakspere's Desdemona deserts her parents' home in the dark of the night. Listen to her speech before the Senate:

"My downright violence and storm of fortunes
May trumpet to the world."

Juliet,—is she not a heroic figure? A little girl, in the beginning of the play, whom the nurse calls a lamb, a lady-bird, she grows up before our very eyes. It is wrong to portray her at all times as a little girl. Her monologue, starting with: "Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds" sounds like a trumpet and is written in the style of Marlowe. Juliet is not asking for the night to descend; she is demanding it.

And is not Cordelia a heroic image? Director Fedorov in Sverdlovsk dressed her in military attire, helmet and

armor. The same thing was done by Kozintzev in Lenin-grad. Cordelia leads an army to rescue her father.

On the other hand, a woman who displays blind obedience, the unthinking Ophelia,—perhaps good-hearted, but following blindly the will of her father,—goes to inevitable doom and her dark destiny. She is sad, but not heroic. Ophelia's obedience to her father makes her a tool in the hands of Hamlet's enemies. She becomes one of the causes of his death. No wonder she loses her mind and sings the songs of a lover lost in a strange land.

The basic aspect of the many-sided genius of Shakspere is his insistence on the natural equality of all men. This is his fundamental theme; without it he would not have been the humanist he was. It is needless to say that this conviction refutes all theories of superior and inferior races. To Shakspere, as he puts it in *Henry IV*, "Homo is a common name to all men." To be sure, these words are uttered by a shady character, Gadshill, but in Shakspere the characters are not necessarily expressing their own opinions.

In certain instances the characters fulfill the function of the chorus and the sentiments expressed by them do not at all belong to their parts.

To take only one example. When Cordelia says: "Then poor Cordelia; And yet not so, since I am sure my love's more richer than my tongue." These are not her own opinion; through her the chorus appeals to the audience.

Suffice it to recall the words of the French king in *All is Well that Ends Well*:

"Strange is it that our bloods, of color, weight and heat, poured all together, would quite confound distinction."

Suffice it, too, to recall *The Winter's Tale*, wherein we are told that the same sun warms the cabin of the poor man and the sumptuous palace of the lord. Such statements do not fit within the construction of the role but are of great importance for the understanding of the principal theme.

But the play wherein this idea of natural equality of men is most brilliantly expressed is *Othello*. The enormous popularity of *Othello* in the Soviet Union is explained mainly by the humanist content of the tragedy.

Some great actors in the past had interpreted this play as a tragedy of jealousy, others stressed the humanity underlying the protagonist's character. Othello, of course, is not a savage, not evil-minded. Pushkin says that by nature Othello is trustful, not jealous. This is clear if we penetrate deeper into the play. Othello-himself says that he was not easily given to jealousy. If Othello were jealous by nature, there would be no need for Iago, who by his cunning and consistent intrigue forces Othello to commit the outrage. The Soviet theater presented Othello in this light, as a good man, as the victim of Iago, and not of natural jealousy; it interpreted *Othello* as a tragedy of betrayed confidence. Ostozshev in Radlov's production did so. In his correspondence Radlov laid stress on this side of Othello. The same interpretation prevailed in the production on the Georgian stage, in the theater of Rustavelli: black man and heroic white girl love one another; love, the voice of nature, united them, as it united Florizel and Perdita in *The Winter's Tale*.

However, the question will be asked: what about Shylock? Is not the dark image of Shylock a disproof of views expounded here? It is not difficult to answer this question. To a great extent Shylock is the type of an English Puritan of that epoch. He also has another side: while he attacks, he is himself a victim and suffering. To divide the play into bright images of Antonio and his friends, and dark images of Shylock and his entourage, as some Shaksperians do, is not the Shaksperian approach to the subject. Is not Antonio wicked?

A fierce, passionate man of the Renaissance is Shylock. Being a Shaksperian character he is many-sided. Pushkin pointed out this diversity. Comparing Shakspere and Molière, Pushkin says that the miser in Molière is only avaricious. Shylock is also greedy, but he is a good father, etc. There were actors, and great ones, who were able to arouse sympathy for Shylock. One of them, Edmund Kean, playing Shylock, elicited tears from the audience. Heine wrote that subjectively Shakspere perhaps had in mind to entertain an audience with Shylock, objectively he created an image which brings forth both sympathy and anger, because Shylock is not only the aggressor, but also the

victim of aggression. This article by Heine, to a great extent, was the result of the impression created by Kean.

Ira Aldridge, the negro tragedian, who visited Russia in the fifties of the last century, interpreted *Othello* as a play full of sympathy for the black man. Aldridge fought for the liberation of Negroes from slavery; he usually gave half of his earnings to this cause. While acting, he agitated for the liberation of enslaved peoples, and for Shylock, too.

Thus the image of Shylock does not contradict the basic humanistic theme in Shakspere. Moreover, the play contains many passages which are in the same vein, confirming the natural equality of men. Shylock says: "Hath not a Jew eyes? Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as a Christian is?"

Today, when we are paying homage to Shakspere as the great humanist, there inevitably comes the question of his attitude to war.

If we are to look for what Shakspere says about war, we shall find such epithets as "cruel and dark war", "war of destruction", "the all-abhorred war." To Shakspere a war is justified by its just ends. I shall recall to you the end of *Cymbeline*, when the patrician Roman armies flee under the pressure of Bellarius and the young princes. People who came from the mountains are attacking the patricians who are retreating. Such a war in defense of homeland is justified. In *Henry IV* we find such justification expressed in remarkable words.

These are the Shaksperian ideas which are so precious today. His genius is not passive; it is an active force for humanism. Although his heroes perish, his villains also go disgracefully down. Shamefully perish Iago, Goneril and Regan, all of them revealed in their true natures. Edmund falls in the duel with Edgar; Claudio dies disgraced. With the strong conviction that Shakspere is with us in our struggle of today, with the feeling of joy that in spite of the war we continue to study Shakspere, to love him even more, allow me to conclude my report.

TEACHING THE SHAKSPERIAN DRAMA BY CLYDE F. LYTTLE

TO many students Shakspere is a closed book because the poetic form is to them a strange medium, incapable of yielding enjoyment, just as music sometimes falls on deaf ears and unmoved hearts. No one will deny that the more truly young people can see what Shakspere meant them to see, the clearer will be their thought and the keener their delight. Shakspere wrote his plays to be acted. For his effects he depended on the actor's art, relying on the vitality of the player's grasp of imagination to hold his mirror up to nature. He wrote inspired verse, but he wrote it for delivery with all the sonorous orchestration that a trained and beautiful voice can bring to the magic of speech.

For more than a quarter of a century, teaching emphasis in classroom instruction in Shakspere has veered toward this dramaturgic approach to the play as a play. Pupils are made familiar with the conventions and mechanics of the theatre and the stage becomes their laboratory. Nearly all the individual editions of Shakspere's plays intended for school use published in recent years lay heavy stress on visualization and dramatization. The trend is reflected, too, in teaching suggestions in currently used anthologies and the recommendations of current courses of study in English. Typical of the attitude is the comment: "Since the plays were written to be acted, the most obvious way of increasing understanding and enjoyment of them is to see them well acted or to act them."¹

In 1932, Henry W. Simon, discussing the teaching of Shakspere in American schools and colleges, declared: "Though school presentations (of plays) are so common now . . . Shakspere is anything but the most frequently produced drama . . . Shakspere does have a part in the movement to produce plays in schools, but he is hopelessly outranked by the whipped-cream school of drama, represented by plays that are sweet, smooth, clean, and spineless."²

No one familiar with the practice of play production in American schools would attempt to demonstrate that Simon was wrong in his judgment or that the situation he describes

has materially changed in the decade which has followed the publication of his book. There are, however, certain evidences that teachers are active in a movement to restore Shakspere to the school stage. Charles Fowler Van Cleve, in a study of the teaching of Shakspere in American Secondary schools, reports a number of group projects engaging each pupil in some kind of purposeful activity which ultimately contributes to the study program of the entire class group.³ At times, such projects take the form of the production of short versions of the plays; in other instances, presentations are made of a complete Shaksperian play. In some communities strong traditions have been established, through the years, for the production of an annual Shaksperian play. Cincinnati, Chattanooga, Birmingham, and Minneapolis are representative of this traditional practice.

"In an Alabama community, scenes from several Shaksperian plays were played under the live oaks before some of the civic clubs in 1936-37.

"A Florida senior high school urges its students to witness the play staged annually by the local junior college students. In 1936-37 *The Taming of The Shrew* was produced.

"A Tennessee community has witnessed forty successive annual productions by the Shakspere Club of its high school. *Twelfth Night* was produced in 1936-37.

"One teacher in a large Ohio city has staged a Shaksperian play annually for fifteen years in her school. She asserts that 'the constant rehearsals give interpretative possibilities (in abundance) for characterization.' In her school all departments which can contribute share in the preparation of the production.

"A teacher in the State of Washington asserts that she does not 'Teach Shakspere any more—but sees it along with her pupils.' The reference is to the program of the state theatre which takes Shakspere to the schools throughout the state by employing the services of the Seattle Repertory Theatre. In 1936-37 this group of highly trained professional actors played *The Comedy of Errors* to 27,000 high school pupils in twenty playing centers throughout the state. The state department of education has officially sponsored the movement. The direction officials look upon it as a

'fusion and correlation of School and the Theatre' and assume an 'obligation . . . to give the students . . . what is the best by the highest and most exacting adult standards.'

"Great Shaksperian actors have been brought to an Arizona city under the auspices of the English department of the senior high school. The teacher reporting states that the entire theatre is always sold out to high school pupils at a special matinee."⁴

The Quarterly Bulletin of the National Theatre Conference reports in its field notes on productions of *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *As You Like It*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Othello* in several school and community theatres during the 1940-41 season. *Center Aisle*, a journal devoted to the activities of the noncommercial theatre, records that *The Taming of the Shrew* stood fourth in popularity among the plays produced by community groups during the first five months of 1941. Many little theatre groups throughout the country are committed to the policy of presenting at least one play by Shakspere each season and are discovering that these plays have not lost their box-office value. Shaksperian Festivals have gained considerable prestige for several college theatres. In a number of communities, investigators would probably find annual productions of Shakspere actively maintained and well supported.

Opportunities can be created both within the schools and in the non-commercial theatre for a restoration of Shakspere's plays to the stage if teachers are convinced that performances of the plays studied in high school are vital to an intelligent appreciation of those dramatic masterpieces.

Certain desirable objectives might also be gained through wider use of motion picture productions of the plays. At least four of Shakspere's plays have been filmed. *The Taming of the Shrew*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *As You Like It* exist in modern sound versions, besides several early attempts at production in the era before the development of the talking motion picture.

Recordings of the plays for school use have been released by Harper and Brothers, and a recent venture of R. C. A. Victor is the release of a record-drama of *Macbeth* with

Maurice Evans and Judith Anderson as the co-stars. Walter Ginsberg reports on an experiment conducted in twenty-five schools with the Harper recordings and their accompanying texts.⁵ Says Ginsberg: "Reports preponderantly favor the use of recordings in teaching Shakspere. . . . Study with records produced general comprehension and general enjoyment. More specifically, it increased understanding of the action, of the characters, of the backgrounds, of obscure passages, and the ideas and appreciation of Shakspere as poet and playwright, of the individuality of the characters, of the humor, and of the beauty of spoken verse. It stimulated classroom discussions, voluntary memorization of famous passages and voluntary further reading of Shakspere.

Summarizing the investigation, he asserts: "Along a wide educational trend, the Mercury Recordings proved a valuable aid to the appreciation of Shakspere in the classroom. . . . It is the dramatic approach to Shakspere that the recordings serve so well, displacing neither pupil nor teacher but stimulating and heightening the efforts of both."⁶

The resourceful teacher will find many avenues of approach to the problem of providing a more direct contact with Shakspere than that which is the outcome of the traditional methods of study. That such contacts are desirable was demonstrated in a series of experiments recently conducted by the writer which proved that performance is an effective aid to classroom study of drama. The procedure is reported in detail in his dissertation, "The Effectiveness of Stage Presentation as a Supplement to Shaksperean Study in the Secondary Schools," New York University, 1942.

¹Ida Jewett, *Shakespeare for Today*, World Book Company, Yonkers-on-Hudson, 1940, page VIII.

²Henry W. Simon, *The Reading of Shakespeare in American Schools and Colleges*, p. 150.

³Charles F. Van Cleve, *The Teaching of Shakespeare in American Schools*, Peabody College for Teachers, 1937, p. 103-104.

⁴Charles F. Van Cleve, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103.

⁵Walter Ginsberg, "How Helpful Are Shakespeare Recordings?" *English Journal*, XXIX, April, 1940, p. 296.

⁶Walter Ginsberg, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

SHAKSPERE'S STAGE BUSINESS

BY SAMUEL A. SMALL

DURING the years of his apprenticeship in the late eighties and early nineties of the sixteenth century Shakspere used the stock material already at hand in the theatrical world. In tragedy, he presented on the stage physical horrors, violent deaths, rhetorical speeches, and ghosts—a lurid, naive attraction for his spectators. *Titus Andronicus* is rich in this theatrical business and at the time when Elizabethan plays were beginning to take shape, this tragedy must have been highly successful as a stage production. To the end of his career Shakspere's taste for this popular form of theatricality never subsided. Revolting horrors are to be found in *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *King Lear*. The materials in these later tragedies are the same in kind as those in the early ones; the difference between the early and the later tragedies is in the way this stock material is treated.

Such a view of Shakspere's stage business points to the manner in which the later material for tragedy was handled. He must have emphasized inner motivation in his characters, rather than mere melodrama where external impression means everything. The idea of the introspective mind suffering from mental inhibitions is the way Shakspere in his later plays prepares the audience for an approaching horror. And in his mature drama this approach creates an enlivening sense of suspense that is more important than the horror itself. This conscience-suspense forms a subtle point of technique which this paper will attempt to describe.

Poets and playwrights of the sixteenth century were aware of the effect of horror on the mind, and it was only a step further for them to feel forebodings of all sorts in the presence of tragic happenings. The classic line of Shakspere for this sentiment is uttered by Hamlet:

But break my heart, for I must hold my tongue.

Somewhat the same sentiment is found in *Macbeth*, IV, iii:

Give sorrow words: the grief that does not speak
Whispers the o'erfraught heart, and bids it break.

Similarly in Webster and Ford we find:

Unkindness, do thy office; poor heart, break:
Those are the killing griefs which dare not speak.

The White Devil, II, i.

The source of this idea, found so commonly in Elizabethan drama, is the well known line from Seneca:

They are the silent griefs which cut the heart-strings.

The Broken Heart, V, iii.

The inner reaction of the character inhibits speech, and creates a dramatic pause. It is this technical stage business that Shakspere uses effectively after he wrote *Titus Andronicus*. The "hush" represents the person's conscience¹ and particularly identifies the hero as a conscience type of man who is thoroughly aware of the approaching horror. This highly tempered type is handled by Shakspere in four tragedies so delicately that the whole light-and-shade drawing of each character depends on subtle stage business. In *Richard III*, it is used near the end of the play when the ghosts of the murdered men appear; it is used technically as forebodings in *Julius Caesar*; it dominates Hamlet's idealism; and it becomes spectacular in *Macbeth*. This humanizing pause or hesitation identifies the thoroughly English type of hero which grew out of the materials of *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Titus Andronicus*, and other plays of Early English Drama. Early in his career Shakspere drew *Titus Andronicus* as a daemonic type of man having the marks of the Senecan type, but lacking Seneca's use of conscience. This superficial adaptation of Seneca characterized the early English imitators.

Richard III marks an advance. Although Richard is essentially a daemonic type of man, in the last part of the play a revolting conscience makes him human. He has conducted his life of murder through a set policy that is clearly stated in the soliloquy in *Henry VI, Part III*, Act III, ii. At the mention of the name Richmond in Act IV, iii, of *Richard III*, the element of fear for the first time enters Richard's mind. This physical fear expresses itself through the agency of a prophecy which Richard twice recalls with uneasiness:

Carue leves loquuntur ingentis stupent.

Hippolytus, 615.

As I remember, Henry the Sixth
Did prophesy that Richmond should be king,
When Richmond was a little peevish boy.
A king, perhaps, perhaps, (IV, ii)
Richmond! When last I was at Exeter,

The major in courtesy show'd me the castle,
And called it Rougemont: at which name I started,
Because a bard of Ireland told me once,
I should not live long after I saw Richmond.

For a time, while he is wooing Queen Elizabeth's daughter through the mother, Richard manages by the force of his strong intellect to play the hypocrite to deceive the queen as he did Anne. But his hypocrisy drops off and his irritable replies betray the confused state of his mind:

King R. Fly to the duke. [To Ratcliff] Post thou to Salisbury:
When thou comest thither,—[To Catesby] Dull unmind-
ful villain,
Why stand'st thou still, and go'st not to the duke?
(IV, iv, 442-445)

Stan. Richmond is on the seas.

King R. There let him sink, and be the seas on him!
White-liver'd runagate, what doth he there?

(IV, iv, 463-465)

Third Mess. My lord, the army of the Duke of Buckingham—

King Rich. Out on you, owls! nothing but songs of death?
(IV, iv, 508-509)

His mind now becomes introspective. This condition is revealed in two passages just before the entrance of the ghosts. Both passages indicate a morbid, self-questioning state of mind:

King R. Up with my tent there! here will I lie to-night:
But where to-morrow? Well, all's one for that.
(V, iii, 7-8)

King R. I have not that alacrity of spirit,
Nor cheer of mind, that I was wont to have.
(V, iii, 73-74)

The ghosts represent revulsions of conscience. The inner effect on him is immediate. He ramifies and judges his own soul:

Give me another horse: bind up my wounds.
Have mercy, Jesu! — Soft! I did but dream.
O coward conscience, how dost thou afflict me!
The lights burn blue. It is now dead midnight.
Cold fearful drops stand on my trembling flesh.
What do I fear? myself? There's none else by:
Richard loves Richard; that is, I am I.
Is there a murderer here? No. Yes, I am:
Then fly. What, from myself? Great reason why:
Lest I revenge. What, myself upon myself?
Alack, I love myself. Wherefore? for any good

That I myself have done unto myself?
 O, no! alas, I rather hate myself,
 For hateful deeds committed by myself!
 I am a villain: yet I lie, I am not.
 Fool, of thyself speak well: fool, do not flatter.
 My *conscience* hath a thousand several tongues, etc.

(V, iii, 178-208)

Richard manages to repress his conscience before the battle:

Let not our babbling dreams affright our souls:
Conscience is but a word that cowards use,
 Devised at first to keep the strong in awe:

(V, iii, 309-311)

Through the greater portion of the tragedy, Richard is made emotionless by a strong intellect which is allied to his evil ambition. His conscience does not permeate his mind either before or during the execution of his crimes. As has been pointed out, however, after the appearance of a formidable antagonist, his conscience makes itself felt, and pantomimic stage business begins.

Likewise, Brutus' character is conditioned by the working of his conscience. Philosophical by nature and entertaining only good motives, his stoical calmness makes it hard for us to detect his feelings. His mind will not harbor the first suggestion of a conspiracy:

Into what dangers would you lead me, Cassius,
 That you would have me seek into myself
 For that which is not in me?

Julius Caesar, I, ii.

Having no personal cause for murdering Caesar, his conscience rises against it:

Between the acting of a dreadful thing
 And the first motion, all the interim is
 Like a phantasma or a hideous dream.

II, i.

The stage business in acting the role of Brutus is made difficult by the inner conflicts in this character's mind. Portia tells us of his actions which betray the workings of conscience against murder. Even when murder seems to him the best policy, he refuses to murder Antony with Caesar.

Brutus' strong mind is broken down by the quarrel with Cassius and this is followed by grief at the death of Portia. The first sign of fear is pretty clearly brought out in the farewell speeches between Brutus and Cassius:

And whether we shall meet again I know not.
Therefore our everlasting farewell take.
For ever, and for ever, farewell, Cassius!

The stage business necessary to the growing importance of Brutus' conscience is most difficult because it is restricted by Brutus' stoical character. Dialogue must be subordinated to stage business when the actor wishes to demonstrate introspective reactions. In the case of Brutus, the stage business must be under strict control as Brutus shows only a slight outward confusion of mind. Nevertheless, his conscience is uneasy at the thought of evil from the very beginning of the play making it necessary for the actor to make a special study of this element in the play.

In the case of Hamlet, conscientious inhibitions in his mind are apparent everywhere in the play. In the long and frequent soliloquies, his conscientious reflections on life are uncertain and punctuated by pauses. This all means that, unlike the case of Brutus, the actor can be free with his stage business to make Hamlet the uncontrolled individual that he is. Hamlet is all thought and utterance; he can direct his will and conscience toward any problem and build up schemes in his mind to satisfy his frustrated ideals.

In Macbeth, on the other hand, there is a stoppage of thought and utterance; he is the most cosmic of all Shakspeare's tragic figures. This cosmic sense, which emanates from evil acts, brings to the character of Macbeth a transcendent feeling of guilt. He has related his guilt to all nature: "The very stones prate of my whereabouts." Since there are frequent "hush" pauses, filled with the consciousness of guilt, the actor must use his pantomimic stage business with mathematical precision. I think the precision of bodily motion and the economy of uttered words make Macbeth a much more difficult part to play than Hamlet whose experimental type of mind gives freedom to the actor.

Shakspeare's conception of tragedy underwent a considerable change in drawing the character of Brutus. Such characters as the two murderers in *Richard III*, though they crudely demonstrated the value of conscience-suspense before the deed, could not be fully handled as tragic figures. They are confirmed villains and therefore lack the proper susceptibility for subtle dramatic treatment. For the same

reason Richard is attractive in his intellectual dominance of the world about him. Richard has no concern for the finer feelings. As a man of policy and direct action, there is found in his nature no tendency for reflective thought. We have noticed that a revulsion of conscience in the Fifth Act is made possible by the use of psychological means, especially at the mention of the name of Richmond, to reduce Richard's mind to a state of introspective fear. To present characterization through the use of conscience, it was necessary for Shakspere to create a part whose action was of a far different kind from Richard's. The mind of the protagonist had to be sensitive and imaginative, so that it might respond delicately to the voice of conscience. Brutus is a character of such a type. He is not so imaginative, however, as Hamlet or Macbeth. His intellectual training was such as to cultivate the moral side of his life and to give him a somewhat stoic attitude toward the world around him.

From Richard through Brutus and Hamlet to Macbeth, Shakspere evinces a growing interest in the deeper and finer side of inner conflicts. In Richard conscience-suspense is used merely as a stage device; in Brutus it becomes part of the man's intellectual sense of duty; in Hamlet it is rooted in the man's cultural self; and in Macbeth it becomes a self communion between the man and his soul.

Huntington College, Indiana.

¹See Stoll and Adams on conscience as an active force in Shakspere: Stoll, E. E., *Shakspere Studies*, pp. 92-93; Adams, J. Q., *Macbeth* (ed. 1931), p. 134.

MAGIC—OF AN AGE AND FOR ALL TIME

BY CLAIRE McGLINCHEE

THE people of the Elizabethan Age were decidedly interested in magic in its various manifestations. Our proof of this fact is the number of significant dramas of that Golden Age of the theatre that concern themselves with the supernatural, in tragic or in comic vein.

Robert Greene gives titular emphasis to that theme in his pleasant comedy of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. The learned Friar Bacon is not only master of the crystal globe, which power he voluntarily gives up by smashing the magic glass with his own hands, but he is near to great achievement in the business of the brazen head, through which power he would wall all England with brass—had the stupid boy Miles not broken the charm. Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* presents the appalling spectacle of a brilliant doctor willing to sell his soul to Satan for all Eternity for the possession of unlimited magic power during a paltry twenty-four years.

Ghosts and witches were common apparitions to the Elizabethans—all varieties of these spirits. As in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, there were spirits visible to one character alone in a group and others which are seen by all present. Shakspere makes constant and effective use of these voices of Destiny, instigators of revenge, and weavers of mood and atmosphere. He has, too, actual fairies, the loveliest in all the world of literature or fact. Indeed, these tiny creatures stand guard at both ends of his career—Puck near the start and Ariel witness to the closing of not only Prospero's magic book, but of the more enchanting book of Shakspere the dramatist.

Even classic Ben Jonson, at once contemporary of and successor to Shakspere, shows in his *The Alchemist*, clever parody of human gullibility, that Elizabethan interest in the supernatural continued after the age was more accurately termed Jacobean.

It is interesting today to observe how time has dated some of this magic, proving it to have been "of an age" and how some—that of Shakspere himself—is, as he himself is, "for all time".

Marlowe's is the dated magic. In the opening scene of *Dr. Faustus*, the learned scholar, after his first visitation from the Good and Evil Angels—that touch of the Medieval Morality play—claims thus when left alone:

How am I glutted with conceit of this!
Shall I make spirits fetch me what I please,
Resolve me of all ambiguities,
Perform what desperate enterprise I will?
I'll have them fly to India for gold,
Ransack the ocean for orient pearl,
And search all corners of the new-found world
For pleasant fruits and princely delicates:
I'll have them read me strange philosophy
And tell the secrets of all foreign kings;
I'll have them wall all Germany with brass,
And make swift Rhine circle fair Wittenberg;
I'll have them fill the public schools with silk,
Wherewith the students shall be bravely clad;
I'll levy soldiers with the coin they bring,
And chase the Prince of Parma from our land,
And reign sole king of all the provinces;
Yea, stranger engines for the brunt of war
Than was the fiery keel at Antwerp's bridge,
I'll make my servile spirits to invent.

To eyes and minds of the year 1943, there seems to be no magic here at all. Certainly no one today would write a bond with Mephistophilis in his own blood to achieve these virtual commonplaces. "I'll have them fly to India for gold"! Planes enough from England, Europe, and the United States are roaring over India today, and what would Marlowe and his Faustus have said to our President's daring and successful flight to Casablanca for the historic conference with Mr. Churchill? "Ransack the ocean for orient pearl." An interview between William Beebe and Christopher Marlowe would be interesting at this point. For the pleasant fruits and princely delicates—the grapes out of season—that Faustus procures for the Duchess as one of the major conjurations—the man of our time need take only a few steps to the nearest de luxe grocery store.

In our days of Special Cables to newspapers, of radios, of dictaphones, what secrets of what foreign kings are difficult to learn? The difficulty now is rather to find the foreign kings! The particular ambition of most meddlers in the black arts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was

apparently to wall some country with brass. That as an achievement does not stir the ambitions of our day, though figuratively speaking, we are doing that very thing to Germany now.

The skilled engineer of our age would not be stumped to turn the current of a river, and but for war-time priorities and our boycotting of the goods from certain sources, our public schools would, like Ben Jonson's Julia, go in silks. All the eyes of the sixteenth century would blink at the strange engines for the brunt of war that are being turned out of the world's factories now by the thousands and the millions.

Yes, Marlowe's magic seems pretty humdrum to us, but what of Shakspere's?

It still requires an out and out fairy to "hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear." The prediction that after the war no place in the world will be further away in point of time from any other place in the world than sixty hours of flying is breath-taking. But Shakspere's Puck, when sent by Oberon to fetch the Love-in idleness (the fairies' love potion) and to return "Ere the leviathan can swim a league," replied:

"I'll put a girdle round about the earth in forty minutes." There's a record. Ariel exceeded even this. When his master, Prospero, urged him to speed, he answered: "I drink the air before me, and return Or e'er your pulse twice beat."

I think we should need the combined offices of Oberon and Puck to settle so happily such distressing human differences as the present counterparts of the quarrels of Demetrius, Helena, Hermia, and Lysander.

Shakspere's spirits are true fairies, matchless in daintiness of person and of tongue. They never grow up; they never die, and their magic lives with them and continues to enchant us poor mortals.

New York, N. Y.

SHAKSPERE AND SIR THOMAS MOORE*

BY PAUL DEUTSCHBERGER

THE object of this paper is to consider the present status of the question regarding Shakspere's alleged authorship of three pages (folios 8a, 8b, 9a) of *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, and to present a reargument of several aspects of the case.

As is now generally known, this play, dating from the late sixteenth century¹, exists in manuscript (*Harleian 7368*) at the British Museum. It was published for the first time in 1844 by Alexander Dyce who ventured no guess as to its authorship. Since then this manuscript has attracted much attention because a number of modern scholars have claimed that at least three pages of it were composed by Shakspere and exist in his own handwriting.

The manuscript bears neither date nor author's name. It was early recognized as the work of more than one dramatist, and, subsequently, in its thirteen folio leaves seven distinct handwritings were noted² which were originally identified (by Dr. Greg) as S, A, B, C, D, and E. Since then S has been shown to be the hand A. Mundy³, A of H. Chettle, B of Heywood⁴, C of T. Kyd⁵, E of T. Dekker and D of possibly Shakspere. The first page of the manuscript carries an injunction, signed by Edmund Tyllney, Master of the Revels, against the production of certain scenes of the play dealing with insurrection.

Hand D is the one claimed to be Shakspere's. Some scholars, namely, E. M. Thompson, A. W. Pollard, J. D. Wilson, C. F. Spurgeon, R. B. McKerrow, C. J. Sisson, J. M. Robertson, E. H. C. Oliphant, T. Baldwin, R. W. Chambers, and J. W. Mackail hold, or have held, that the Insurrection Scene (in D's hand) is Shakspere's. Many others do not accept that theory: S. L. Lee, E. I. Fripp, W. A. Neilson, A. H. Thorndike, H. Spencer, B. R. Lewis, J. Q. Adams, and L. L. Schücking. S. A. Tannenbaum has argued against it at great length, and it is his contribution that has prevented the proponents of the theory of Shakspere's authorship of

*In the preparation of this essay I have had the benefits of frequent consultations with Dr. Samuel Tannenbaum.

the Insurrection Scene from carrying the question by sheer weight of numbers. Finally, a few scholars, E. K. Chambers, W. W. Greg, and F. S. Boas among them, commit themselves neither way, though they incline toward accepting the evidence in favor of Shakspere's authorship of the scene.

That D, the writer of part of the Insurrection Scene, was not one of the original collaborators in the composition of the play is fairly evident. It was the Insurrection to which Tyllney specifically objected; it is therefore, surprising to find no comments of his on ff. 8a, 8b, and 9a. All the other scenes carry notations or marks of deletion in his hand. This must force us to conclude that the "Addition" (as these pages are usually designated) was added to the play after Tyllney had refused to license it.⁶ This inference is corroborated by the fact that at the top of folio 10a (in the hand of Mundy) the concluding lines of Moore's original speech are retained and marked for deletion; as well as by the fact that the verso of folio 9 is blank. D's contribution, we must conclude, was substituted for Mundy's original handling of the scene. Evidently the poet who revised the Insurrection Scene attempted to render innocuous an apparently subversive part of the play by eliminating the objectionable elements in the original version of the scene.⁷

It is possible to conjecture, and, in fact, the late R. W. Chambers has so conjectured, that the original collaborators turned this scene over to some playwright whose political convictions were above question and who would make Sir Thomas speak in a manner to which the censor would not object. But this seems unlikely. Modern criticism is averse to assuming that Elizabethan playwrights expressed their own opinions through their *dramatis personae*. More probably, D assumed a set of political sentiments, not necessarily his own, to construct a scene which would neither give offense to Tyllney, nor disrupt the dramatic continuity of the play.

In the absence of other evidence, the only conclusive way to identify D is by his handwriting, for the Insurrection scene is undoubtedly in the hand of its author. Such an identification is not so simple a matter as R. W. Chambers would have had us believe. It may be very true that, as he says, the writers for the stage from 1590 to 1600 were a "few dozen at most"⁸, but of that few dozen we have specimens

of the colligraphy of only a very small number. If we had none of Shakspere's handwriting, as we have none of Marlow's*, Greene's, or Beaumont's, then the "flavor of the style" and the "nature of the ideas" expressed in the disputed passages would be the only criteria in the case. But in this particular problem, having handwritings available for the determination of the question, we must attach little value to identification through aesthetic means alone. The whole case for Shakspere's authorship of the Addition must stand or fall on the palaeographic evidence alone.

This paper will present (1) a consideration of the aesthetic case, notwithstanding our caveat against it, and (2) a critique of the arguments advanced by the handwriting experts. Dover Wilson's bibliographic testimony⁹ is pure hypothesis without any scientific foundation, and, as such, has been already fully answered.¹⁰ We shall not, therefore, examine it here.

II

It was not until 1871, when Richard Simpson claimed tentatively that whole sections of *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore* might be Shakspere's¹¹, that the problem arose. Although the existence of the play had been noted in 1721 by Thomas Hearne¹², there was no tradition previous to Simpson's paper linking the play with Shakspere's name. This lack of tradition does seem to speak against the alleged Shaksperian authorship, despite R. W. Chambers' argument that,

"The briefness of the passage, together with the fact that the play was never printed till 1844, is sufficient to explain what in other cases is so serious a difficulty—why there should be no tradition connecting the work with Shakspere."¹³

It does seem likely that if Shakspere had in any way contributed to so important a political play, the fact would somehow have come to light — through the researches perhaps of the eighteenth century scholars, Malone, Johnson, Steevens, or Capell. The length of the passage itself is immaterial. It must be remembered that not the slightest bit of contemporary reference to the play has been discovered. Not alone is it not entered in the Stationer's Registers,

* The recent discovery of a single Marlowe signature does not affect the argument.

but there is no record of performance, nor do any of the available diaries of the period mention the play.

Furthermore, it should not be assumed that the play was unknown before Dyce's edition of it. That J. P. Collier, for instance, knew the play intimately years before its publication is evident from his repeated references to it in his *History of English Dramatic Poetry*¹⁴ (1831).

III

The first argument advanced for the ascription of the scene to Shakspere was the rather ridiculous one that the scene is so good that it must be Shakspere's.

Simpson attributed a large part of *Sir Thomas Moore* to Shakspere on merely subjective grounds. "It depends," he tells us, "on the Shakespearian flavour, which only a critical taste can thoroughly discriminate . . ." How fallacious critical taste can be is sufficiently evident from the fact that Simpson "discriminated" Shakspere not only in D's lines, but in some of those now known to be Heywood's and C's, in many of Mundy's, and all of Dekker's.

Spedding¹⁵ delimited the possible Shakspere contribution to D's Addition, where the problem now rests, because "it shows so marked a superiority to the rest, in every quality of dramatic composition." So impressed was Spedding with the poetry of Moore's speech to the rebels, that he felt obliged to assign the scene to Shakspere; for, said he, "if it were not his, there must have been somebody else then living who could write as well as he."

That scholarship was not impressed by this line of reasoning is evident from the lack of serious critical discussion of the problem until 1916. Spedding himself felt that Simpson "does not pretend to offer *proof of the fact*; he gives reasons for thinking it likely."

Even if the scene did sound Shaksperian, and we shall show that it does not, we would have little reason for assigning it to Shakspere. On the basis of aesthetic criticism alone, how much of Elizabethan dramatic poetry from Marlowe to Webster might be—indeed, has been—assigned to Shakspere! It is certainly not necessary to rehearse here all the profitless arguments over the Shakspere canon. But of great

significance, and indicative of the confusion precipitated by uncontrolled guess-work, is A. W. Pollard's confession that on the basis of taste alone he would assign the disputed scene in *Sir Thomas Moore* to Heywood,¹⁶ an opinion somewhat more tenaciously argued by Schücking.¹⁷

Our task is not to show that the scene is poorly written and therefore cannot be Shakspere's. Such an argument would be as fallacious as Simpson's or Spedding's. In discussing the Shakspere canon, it is just as invalid to reject a poor scene as not Shakspere's because it is poor as to accept a good one as his simply because it is good. Our problem is, rather, to show that Simpson and Spedding, as well as their followers, were mistaken in their observations, substituting opinions for facts.

The authors of *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas Moore*, as A. W. Ward before them,¹⁸ have proceeded on the opinions of Simpson and Spedding in finding in the Insurrection Scene the Shaksperian flavor. Despite the subjective basis of their intuitions, J. M. Robertson asserted that he was from the very first convinced of Shakspere's authorship of the Addition, for, said he, ". . . there can be no pretence that any other man could write such verse."¹⁹ But Furnivall²⁰ and Schücking could find little in the poetry that might be considered Shaksperian. Schücking formulated an excellent case in showing how unShaksperian the scene really is.²¹ Where R. W. Chambers saw "the loftiest arguments on behalf of authority,"²² Schücking found only empty rhetoric and sentimentality.

D often shows himself a poor dramatist. For instance, he takes no advantage of the lines where Moore, having already caught the attention of the rebels, tries to drive home his point. D allows Moore to clinch his argument with a passage lacking in those qualities of poetry which we should look for in a similar situation in Shakspere:

lett me sett vp before your thoughts good freinds
on supposyton, which if you will marke
you shall perceave howe horrible a shape
you ynnovation beres, first tis a sinn
which oft thapposte did forwarne vs of
vrging obedience to aucthority
and twere no error yf I told you all
you wer in armes against g(od).

This passage, poor even as prose, does not present a single poetic image—certainly not a Shaksperian trope. Notice how clumsily D pads out the metre of his lines. One could hardly imagine Shakspere allowing Mark Anthony or even Brutus to address the mob with the pedagogical expression, “lett me sett vp . . . on supposyton.” Besides, no supposition has been set up.

“And twere no error” and “which if you will marke” are the weakest and most obvious padding. “All” is appended to line 7 to fill out the metre, despite the fact that it weakens the line.

In the last, and most important part of Moore’s speech, D breaks down entirely:

wash your foule myndes wt teares and those same hands
 that you lyke rebells lyft against the peace
 lyft vp for peace, and your vnreuerent knees
 make them your feet to kneele to be forgyven
 is safer warrs, than euer you can make
 whose discipline is ryot, why euen yor warrs
 cannot proceed but by obedienç.

“Wash your foule myndes with teares” is nonsense, as is the absurd “your unreuerent knees make them your feet.” The reviser wisely excised the unfurtunate “to kneele . . . is safer warrs,” as well as the absurd exclamation, “why euen yor warrs . . . obedienç.” Do not all wars require obedience? Despite the reviser’s labors the passage remains high-sounding nonsense:

what rebell captaine

as mutynes ar incident, by his name
 can still the rout who will obey a traytor
 or how can well that proclamation sounde
 when ther is no adicion but a rebell
 to quallyfy a rebell.

“As mutynes ar incident” is meaningless. A “name,” even of a “rebell captaine,” cannot still a rout. The English obeyed traitors in the past—Bolingbroke, for instance; and they were to obey Cromwell. History shows that rebels are obeyed. “Rebell” has nothing to do with “proclamation.” A “rebell to quallyfy a rebell” is silly and out of place.

Nor can much sense be made of
 a nation of such barbarous temper
 that breaking out in hiddious violence

woold not afoord you, an abode on earth
whett their detested knyves against your throtes
spurne you lyke doggs, and lyke as yf that god
owed not nor made not you, nor that the elaments
wer not all appropriat to your comforts
but chartered vnto them. . .

Lines five and six of the above passage are hopelessly confused. The metre of line five is pieced out with unnecessary words. Line seven does not scan at all.

If Shaksperian flavor, then, is the test, this scene must be rejected. Of course, this does not prove that Shakspere could not have written it. But then, this is the scene that critics have found so good that if it were not Shakspere's "there must have been somebody else then living who could write as well as he."

Dr. Greg, who originally did not believe the scene Shakspere's,²³ has developed a theory that D was merely a careless contributor who perhaps had neither knowledge of nor interest in the play on which he was at work.²⁴ Such reasoning might conceivably answer the objection that the scene in question might be poor and still be Shakspere's. But is it not ridiculous to claim, on the one hand, that the scene is so good that it must be Shakspere's, and, on the other hand, that it is poor because Shakspere was not interested in what he was writing. And who but an asthetic critic would believe that a poet who was ignorant of the play would have been selected to revise it to meet the censor's objections? or would have attempted to do so?

There is a further objection to the merely aesthetic argument. There are passages in *Sir Thomas Moore* which easily surpass anything in the Insurrection Scene. If we were not limited by the facts, if we did not know that these passages exist in the handwritings of known dramatists, some writers, on the basis of aesthetic criticism alone, would undoubtedly declare them to be Shakspere's. Simpson actually did so. Pollard would do so. Consider, for instance, Mundy's excellent comedy in the Faulkner scene; or C's soliloquy, "It is in heauen that I am thus and thus," which E. K. Chambers finds truly Shaksperian in phraseology and manner.²⁵

Finally, there is much in the Addition, by way of word

and phrase, that is entirely unlike Shakspere's characteristic diction. We shall not here take advantage of Schücking's argument based upon *hapax legomena*. He points out that there are no less than twenty-two specific uses of word and phrase in the Insurrection Scene which are without parallel in Shakspere's acknowledged works.²⁶ Schücking also notes D's fondness for "interrupting himself with a short sentence, commencing with 'as'."²⁷ This occurs three times in 119 lines of the Addition, but seems uncharacteristic of Shakspere's verse. Moore's "say nowe" (line 138) is utterly unShakperian. We may call attention, too, to Lincoln's "Nay *this* a sound fellowe" (line 212), "this" being, of course, a contraction of "this is." Nowhere in Shakspere's prose can any example of this absorption be found.

IV

The second line of argument was first developed in 1923 by the late R. W. Chambers. Taking his cue from Professor W. Raleigh,²⁸ Chambers argued that Shakspere was obsessed with an almost insane fear of social and political chaos. The language in which Shakspere expressed this fear, Chambers finds so intense that it could not have been born out of the "general temper" of the time. Chambers insists that a close relationship exists between Moore's speech and that of Ulysses on Degree in *Troilus and Cressida* (c. 1603). In both he sees an intense expression of the fear of that chaos which should be engendered if the existing social order were overturned.

But the thought in these passages is not unique in the Elizabethan age; neither is the intense expression of that particular fear the hallmark of Shakspere; nor, does Moore's speech to the rebels parallel the speech of Ulysses.

I have already indicated above that we cannot accept the thought of the Insurrection Scene as being any particular Elizabethan dramatist's confession of political faith. The Addition, as it stands, exists only because Mundy had previously written another scene which had proved offensive to Tyllney. Because of the political circumstances surrounding the play, we cannot expect Moore's speech to express any other philosophy than it does.

Nevertheless, Chambers would have us believe that this

particular "intensity" of feeling for social order is to be found only in Shakspere and in D. He asks us to read Sir John Cheke's *The Hurt of Sedition* (1549) in connection with *Sir Thomas Moore* and *Troilus and Cressida*. Cheke, he says,

"never reaches the standpoint to which Shakespeare and the writer of the '147 lines' leap instantly . . . At the back of the mind of both More and Ulysses seems to be a nightmare vision of a world in chaos. This is not common . . . To Shakespeare, and to the writer of the '147 lines,' the disregard of order does not lead up to such commonplace scourges as war, dearth, and pestilence."

This is purposive exaggeration and misrepresentation. Chambers reveals himself to be rather ignorant of a great many Tudor writings—for the above point of view is not at all uncommon. There is, for example, that magnificent passage in Marlowe's translation of Lucan's *Pharsalia*:

Roome was so great it could not beare it selfe:
So when this worlds compounded vnion breaks,
Time ends and to old *Chaos* all things turne;
Confused stars shal meeete, celestiall fire
Fleete on the flouds, the earth shoulder the sea,
Affording it no shoare, and *Phoebe's* waine
Chace *Phoebus* and, inrag'd, afffect his place,
And striue to shine by day, and, ful of strife,
Disolute the engins of the broken world.²⁹

With similar intensity Spenser saw civil confusion as a manifestation of the forces of universal dissolution:

When that brave honour of the Latine name,
Which meard her rule with Africa and Byze,
With Thames inhabitants of noble fame,
And they which see the dawning day arize,
Her nourslings with mutinous uprone
Harten against her selfe, her conquer'd spoile,
Which she had wonne from all the world afore,
Of all the world was spoyl'd within a while.
So when the compast course of the universe
In sixe and thirtie thousand yeares is ronne,
The bands of th'elements shall backe reverse
To their first discord, and shall be quite undonne:
The seedes, of which all things at first were bred,
Shall in great Chaos wombe againe be hid.³⁰
... Nor prince, nor peere, nor kin, they wolde abide . . .³¹
What fell Erynnis . . . Did grype your hearts . . .
That, each to other working cruell wrongs,
Your blades in your owne bowels you embréwd?³²
Thou onely cause, O Civil Furie art: . . .
Didst arme thy hand against thy proper hart.³³

Even the popular sermons of the time expressed this view, and with the same intensity. Consider, for example, the *Homily Against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion* (c. 1570) :

For he that nameth rebellion nameth not a singular or only sin, as is theft, robbery, murder, and such like; but he nameth the whole puddle and sink of all sins against God and man; against his prince, his country, his countrymen, his parents, his children, his kinfolks, his friends, and against all men universally; all sins, I say, against God and men heaped together nameth he that nameth rebellion.⁸⁴

Most damaging to Chambers's argument is the fact that the scene from *Moore* sounds so much like Cheke, that it may very well be considered a kind of metrical paraphrase of Cheke's pamphlet.

The total impression left by Cheke's logic is that rebellion against the king does lead to chaos. Yet, Chambers dismisses Cheke as having the "practical point of view of the ordinary Englishman," in contradistinction to that of Shakspere, and Dr. Chambers finds that "Both Moore and Ulysses depict disobedience as a . . . terrible thing: a thing inconsistent with the order which even war demands: a thing leading straight to anarchy." We must not be misled by the irrelevant quotation from Cheke that Chambers puts into opposition with this statement. Elsewhere, Cheke makes the same point much more spiritedly:

but yee that seeke in word Gods cause, doe break in deed Gods commandement: and yee that seeke the commonwealth, have destroyed the commonwealth: and so yee marre that yee would make, and break that yee would amend, because yee neither seek anything rightly, nor would amend anything orderly.⁸⁵

Cheke, it will be noticed, uses the same antitheses which Moore employs in a similar situation:

and those same hands
that you lyke rebels lyft against the peace
lyft vp for peace . . .

Indeed, in this passage, as in others, Cheke is so close to D in expression and thought, that, using the method of a Spedding or Chambers, we might declare *The Hurt of Sedition* the work of Shakspere.

Chambers, for instance, is impressed by Moore's speech because "it does not stoop to terrorize the rebels . . . (with) talk of gibbets and the hangman, . . . Moore terrorizes the

mob, not by putting before them the penalties involved by the failure of their enterprise, but by the penalties involved by its success. . . ." Certainly this is more true of Cheke. Moore speaks of exile and declares that "mercy may be found." Restored to its proper context, the long passage Chambers quotes from Cheke presents an even more nightmarish aspect than either Moore's speech or that of Ulysses. After listing the evils of sedition, Cheke laments,

in seditiō both parts loseth, the overcommed cannot fly, the overcommer cannot spoile; the more the winner winneth, the more he loseth; the more that escape, the more infamous men live; all that is gained, is scarcely saved, the winning is losse, the losse destruction.³⁶

Moore makes exactly the same point in a less telling way:

you had taught
how insolenc and strong hand shouold prevayle
how ordere shouold be quell'd, and by this patterne
not on of you shouold lyve an aged man.

Where Moore concludes:

submyt you to theise noble gentlemen
entreatē their mediation to the kinge
gyve vp yourself to forme obay the maiestrate
and thers no doubt, but mercy may be found
yf you so seek(yt).

Cheke entreats the rebels with more passion:

Wherfore for Gods sake have pittie on your selves . . . with humble submission acknowledge your faults . . . leave off with repentance . . . aske God forgiveness, submit yee to your King, be contended for a Commonwealth one or two to die, and yee Captains for the residue sacrifice your selves, and yee shall so best attain the Kings gracious pardon . . .³⁷

The major part of Chambers's argument collapses, then, because it can be shown that both Moore's speech and that of Ulysses most certainly arise from the "general temper" of the Tudor period; both resort to a set of conventional images or symbols more properly medieval than Renaissance in nature.

V

The third line of argument is the contention that both Moore and Ulysses appeal to "Degree," that the natural order is based upon an immutable, ascending scale of authority which cannot be interrupted without plunging all things into chaos; and that this appeal to "Degree" is a direct indication of Shakspere's hand.

The truth of the matter is that Moore makes no appeal to "Degree." Even if he did, it would be of little significance in our study. I have elsewhere shown that Ulysses' speech is a mere rephrasing of the commonplace of sixteenth-century political thought, and that it has many analogues in some of the most popular and widely read tracts of the time.⁸⁸

Chambers argues, however, that both speeches proceed with the same logic and the same choice of images, and, accordingly, only Shakspere could have written both. The sequence of image that Chambers draws up is this:

- a) Degree neglected, b) the flood surging over its banks, c) the doing to death of the aged or the babes, d) cannibal monsters.⁸⁹

But let us examine both speeches. Admitting that this is *approximately* the order of images in Ulysses' speech, is it true of Moore's?

Moore begins by declaring that the rebels, in breaking the peace, violate the very security that "brought (them) to the state of men" (lines 75-83). He continues by pointing to the sorry plight of the "wretched straingers" (lines 87-94). From this he returns to his first idea—that if "ordere shouold be quell'd" not one of the rebels "shouold lyve an aged man," for, "men lyke ravenous fishes woold feed on on another" (lines 94-102).

The sequence of thought and image that Chambers constructs does not apply to the logic of Moore's speech. A) Moore says nothing of "Degree". B) The reference to "the flood surging over its banks," (lines 50-52) is no essential part of Moore's speech—it is merely a side remark to the Lord Mayor *et al.*, before Moore begins to address the rebels. In Shakspere's pattern such a catastrophe is the direct sequel to Degree neglected. C) In comparing Ulysses' "And the rude son should strike his father dead," to Moore's picture of the "wretched straingers," Chambers is equating two ideas which have nothing at all in common. Ulysses makes no such appeal as "Helpless childhood or age must suffer" during civil disorder. He is merely restating an axiom of Tudor political thought, that the son owes the same right of obedience to the father that the subject owes to the king. As Professor J. W. Allen puts it:

Every conceivable 'right' expresses Divine Will. Real authority,

whether in a king or in the father of a family, is a right to demand obedience as a duty to God.⁴⁰

Not alone does Moore's speech not follow the neat pattern Chambers has found for it, but the situations surrounding both the *Moore* and *Troilus and Cressida* speeches differ. Moore is trying to quell a rebellion of the lowest stratum of society against constituted authority. Ulysses is not faced with rebellion, but with disharmony among the military leaders. There is no thought of "mob law" in *Troilus and Cressida*, and Chambers does violence to the whole idea of Ulysses' speech by declaring that there is.⁴¹ Moore's main appeal is the sentimental one:

ymagin that you see the wretched straingers
their babyes at their backs, and their poor lugage
plodding tooth ports and costs for transportacion*
and that you sytt as kings in your desyres
authortyty quyte sylent by your braule.

Moore expatiates on the Golden Rule:

what Country . . .
shoold gyve you harbor go you to ffranc or flanders
to any farman province spane or portigall
nay any where that not adheres to Ingland
why you must needs be straingers. woold you be pleased
to find a nation of such barbarous temper
that breaking out in hidious violence
woold not afoord you an abode on earth . . .
what woold you thinck
to be thus vsed, this is the straingers case
and this your momtanish⁴² inhumanity.

There is nothing in *Troilus and Cressida* to parallel this. But Cheke, like D, resorts to this sentimental argument:

remember your wives, your children, your country
and forsake this rebellion.⁴³

Furthermore, unlike Ulysses, Moore appeals, not to Degree, but to the Divine Right of Kings. When Moore tells the rebels

you wer in armes against g[od]
for to the king goth hath his offic lent, etc.,

he is repeating, in almost the same figures, Cheke's

But the Magistrate is the ordinance of God, appointed by him with
the sword of punishment . . . And therefore that that is done by the

* 'Luggage' plodding 'to the ports and coasts' would be unworthy of Shakespere at any time. Absurdity and padding combined.

Magistrate, is done by the ordinance of God, because he hath the execution of Gods office . . .⁴⁴

So Spenser puts forth the same idea:

All in the powre of their great Maker lie:
All creatures must obey the voice of the most Hie.

He maketh kings to sit in soverainty
He maketh subjects to their powre obey.⁴⁵

Not Degree but the sentimental appeal is the central idea of Moore's speech. But it is amusing to find after Chambers has made so much of Shakspere's monopoly on Degree, Anthony Mundy, elsewhere in *Sir Thomas Moore*, summing up the essential thought of Ulysses' speech, making Lincoln say:

obedience is the best in eche degree . . .
I paciently submit to lawe.⁴⁶

As to the "cannibal monsters," Cheke tells us that rebels fall from the state of men to that of animals:

not onely to annoy themselves, but to destroy all other . . . like frantick beasts, raging against their head, doe teare and deface as much as lyeth in them.⁴⁷

Even as Ulysses' speech was a mere poetical summary of several dominant political ideas and religious trends of the sixteenth century, D's arguments are even more lacking in originality. Tyllney's censoring dictated what tone the scene should take; D had no alternative but to subdue the rioters with whatever conventional ideological expressions he could find. The result was a set of political sentiments identical with those then being promulgated by the government's apologists and enunciated from every Anglican pulpit.

Since both Moore's speech and that of Ulysses are merely rewordings of conventional themes, part of a common stock of ideas from which any writer might draw, we must reject this phase of Chambers's case. Furthermore, our analysis demonstrates that D and Shakspere are not one and the same, because Moore's speech and that of Ulysses are wholly unlike in the development of thought and image.

[To be continued]

¹The exact date of the play is still in dispute, suggestions ranging from 1590 to 1608. It seems certain that the play must be dated prior to 1597 on the evidence of Tyllney's injunction on the first page of the ms. After 1597 Sir George Buc, for whom Tyllney

had secured the reversion of the Mastership (J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, 1917, p. 7), gradually took over his ailing uncle's duties. Sisson's objection that *Cupid's Whirligig* was licensed by Tyllney as late as 1607 overlooks the fact that most of the licenses granted during Tyllney's office were granted in his name, so that Tyllney may actually have had nothing at all to do with *Cupid's Whirligig*. We cannot accept Schücking's dating, 1604-5 (*Eng. Studien*, XLVI, 228-251). Oliphant argues almost groundlessly for 1598-9 (*JEGP*, XVIII, 231, 235). Pollard (*Shakespeare's Hand in the Play Sir Thomas More*, 1923, 17-32) argues for 1593-4. In the light of Tannenbaum's researches (*The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, 1927, p. 95-101) early 1593 seems most likely. For, although this date depends largely upon the acceptance of hand C as Kyd's, the political implications of the play and its censoring point to that date.

²The capital letters are Greg's designations in the Malone Society edition of the play.

³"S" meaning "scribe," not Shakspeare, as B. R. Lewis, *Shakespeare Documents*, I, 1940, p. 278n., would have us believe. Greg originally thought that Mundy had acted only as copyist.

⁴Tannenbaum's identification of Heywood on paleographic grounds, *op. cit.*, p. 56-68, must take precedence over Law's counter-arguments on spelling, *U. of Texas Stud. in Eng.*, XI, 1931, p. 24-31.

⁵The objections set forth by Greg, *TLS*, Nov. 24, 1927; *The Library*, IX, 1928, p. 202-211; by McKerrow, *RES*, IV, p. 237; by Sisson, *MLR*, XXIII, 1928, p. 231-234; are merely captious, not based on evidence, and do not invalidate Tannenbaum's theory, *op. cit.*, p. 35-52, *et passim*.

⁶Tannenbaum, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁷In 1592, a year before the play was probably written, Mundy published *The Masque of the League and the Spaniard Discovered* (v., W. C. Hazlitt's *Handbook*, 1867, p. 406) of which, apparently, no copy remains. In 1605 this was re-issued under the title, *Falsehood in Friendship*, the second part of which Mr. Herman R. Mead, Bibliographer of the Huntington Library, has sent me in microfilm reproduction. Since Mundy was the original author of the Insurrection Scene, and since much of the thought of that scene is repeated in *Falsehood in Friendship*, it is safe to assume that D's creative part in the play is not as large as was formerly supposed. But that is a study in itself.

⁸*Man's Unconquerable Mind*, 1939, p. 209.

⁹*Sb's H. in STM*, p. 113-141.

¹⁰Tannenbaum, *Shakspeare and Sir Thomas Moore*, 1929, p. 44-60, *Hjort, Lond, Merc.*, Nov., 1924, p. 80-81.

¹¹*NQ*, July 1, 1871, p. 1-3.

¹²*Collections*, IX, p. 393.

¹²*Collections*, IX, p. 393

¹³*Sb's H. in STM*, p. 143.

¹⁴I, p. 94; II, p. 435; III, p. 372.

¹⁵*NQ*, Sept. 21, 1927, p. 228.

¹⁶*Sb's H. in STM*, p. 14.

¹⁷*RES*, I, p. 41-49.

¹⁸*Hist. of Eng. Dram. Lit.*, 1874, II, p. 214-217.

¹⁹*The Genuine in Shakespeare*, 1930, p. 135.

²⁰*Intro.*, *Royal Shakespeare*, 1894, p. cviii-cxv.

²¹*RES*, I, p. 41-49.

²²*Sb's H. in STM*, p. 178.

²³*Malone Soc. ed.*, p. xiii.

²⁴*Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*

²⁵*William Shakespeare*, I, 1930, p. 514.

²⁶*RES*, I, p. 44-45.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 45.

²⁸*Shakespeare*, 1907, p. 191-192.

²⁹*Works of Christopher Marlowe*, Tucker Brooke, ed., 1910, p. 650, lines 72-80.

³⁰*Ruines of Rome*, stanza, xxii.

³¹*Ibid.*, xxiii.

³²*Ibid.*, xxiv.

³³*Ibid.*, xxxi.

³⁴*Ibid.*, xxxi.

³⁴*Homilies*, Griffiths, ed., 1859, p. 569.

³⁵*The True Subject to the Rebell, or The Hurt of Sedition How Grevious It is to a Common Wealth*, 1641, p. 3.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 63.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 64.

³⁷SAB, XVII, p. 200-207; vide, in connection with this, Fulke Greville's *Poems of Monarchy, Works*, Grosart, ed., 1870, p. 119, stanza 324; Bodin, *Six Books of the Republic*, Bk. III, R. Nolles, trans., p. 387.

³⁸MLR, XXVI, 1931, p. 264.

⁴⁰*Hist. of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, 1928, p. xiv-xv.

⁴¹*Sh's H. in STM*, p. 157.

⁴²Dyce substitutes "mountanish." Brooke defends the ms. reading as something like "mohamedanish." There are two other possible readings; "Montanish," referring to the Montanist sect; the Gnostics prided themselves on being the guardians of the spirit, the Montanists on being the guardians of the law. Those who take the law wilfully might be called "Montanists." The word itself was not strange to the sixteenth century, *v.*, Hammer, *Anc. Eccl. Hist.*, 1577; Greville's *Heskin's Parl.*, 1579; and Hooker's *Eccl. Pol.*, 1597. The second reading is a derivation of "maumet," literally "an idol." This was generally a term of abuse—as "mome" it was common in the drama of Udall's time. Cf. *Romeo and Jul.*, III, v. 186; Haughton, *Englishmen for My Money*, IV, ii. Drayton refers to "Mominish sects," *Barons Warres*, II, iv.

⁴³*Op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁵FQ, V, canto II, xl.

⁴⁶Folio 11a, line 60.

⁴⁷*Op. cit.*, p. 16.

⁴⁸*Sh's H. in STM*, p. 156.

⁴⁹RES, VI, 1930, p. 1-14.

⁵⁰2*Hen* VI, IV, vii.

⁵¹*Rich* III, I, ii.

⁵²M.N.D., II, i.

⁵³*Hen* V, IV, vii.

⁵⁴PMLA, LVII, 1942, p. 638-653.

⁵⁵*Hamlet*, I, i.

⁵⁶*Rich* II, I, ii.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, IV, i.

⁵⁸*Institutio*, Lefranc, ed., p. 774.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 775, 776, *et passim*.

⁶⁰*Annotation to the Thirteenth Chapter of the Romans*, Parker Soc., p. 103.

⁶¹*De Vera Obedientia*, Eng. trans. 1553, Janelle, ed., 1930, p. 97.

⁶²*The Last Trumpet* (1550), EETS, xv, 1872, p. 69.

⁶³*De Reginime Principum*, 1482, lib. I, pt. 2, chap. 12.

⁶⁴*Op. cit.*, p. 4.

⁶⁵*The Way to Wealth* (1550), EETS, xv, 1872, p. 131.

⁶⁶*M. Ven.*, I, i.

⁶⁷*Seven Sermons* (1549), Arber repr., 1869, p. 49.

⁶⁸*Cor.* I, vi.

⁶⁹*Schoolmaster*, III, Giles, ed., 1864, p. 128.

⁷⁰*Cor.* I, i.

⁷¹Quoted by Dyce, *Sir Thomas More*, 1844, p. ix.

⁷²*Op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁷³*A Supplicacyon for the Beggers* (1529), Eng. Scholar's Lib., 1878, p. 7-8.

⁷⁴EETS, Cowper, ed., 1871, j. 81.

⁷⁵Merrill, *Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald*, 1925, p. 391.

⁷⁶*The Way to Wealth*, p. 132.

⁷⁷Florio's trans., Everyman ed., II, 1921, p. 186.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, II, 271.

⁷⁹*Inferno*, VII, 8.

⁸⁰*Purgatorio*, XX, 10.

⁸¹*Asinaria*, II, iv; may I here thank Professor Garrett Mattingly for tracing the

origin of this famous expression, as well as for other useful material too general for specific mention?

⁸²*Poetae Bucolici et Didactic*, "Phile de Animalibus, etc.," Dubner, ed., 1863, p. 27.**

⁸³*Der Physiologus in der Elisabetbanischen Literatur*, 1930.

⁸⁴*Euphues*, Croll and Clemens, eds, 1916, p. 64.

⁸⁵*RES*, I, p. 44.

⁸⁷*Poetaster*, c. 1601, V, iii, line 158.

⁸⁸Private communication from Professor Palmer.

⁸⁹*Dutch Courtesan*, I, i, line 1.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, line 39.

⁹¹*Sb's H. in STM*, p. 167.

⁹²*RES*, I, 57-58.

⁹³*2Hem VI*, IV, ii.

⁹⁴*STM*, I, i.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*

⁹⁶Tannenbaum's *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, 1927, especially with its identification of Hand C as Kyd's seems to suggest Marlowe as D.

⁹⁷Schücking has suggested Drayton as a possibility, *RES*, I, p. 57. *The Barons Warres* (1596, 1603) alone presents much material for a line of argument such as Chambers' or Spurgeon's. D's curious use of "incident" is repeated in Bk. III, 9. The sentimentality of D appears fullblown in Bk. IV, 47. Bk. IV, 55-55, is a hymn to order with much in common with Ulysses' speech on Degree, and, in itself, an adequate refutation of Chambers' thesis that D and Shakspere only spoke with the greatest intensity on that subject. D's concept of Magistrates is repeated in Bk. V, 17, and more explicitly in Bk. V, 36. Drayton's use of "momish" has been commented upon above, note 42.

⁹⁸Haughton, like Drayton, was a frequent collaborator with Mundy, Chettle, and Heywood. He was probably writing for the stage as early as 1593. Baugh, *William Haughton's Englishmen for My Money*, 1917, suggests that Henslowe's "yonge horton" meant that Houghton was younger than the other playwrights working for him, not necessarily a youth. It must be remembered that he is not to be confused with the Haughton who was incorporated in the M.A. degree at Cambridge in 1604 as Cooper (*Athenae Cantabrigiensis*, II, 399) believed (Baugh, *op. cit.*, p. 15).

MUCH ADO ABOUT SOMETHING*

BY GEORGE C. TAYLOR

THE proverbial cow which always gave five gallons of milk at each milking and always ended by kicking the full pail over, comes to mind as one reads Kelley's in many ways valuable work. This book is certain to prove of great interest and value to all Milton scholars. Particularly valuable is Professor Kelley's bibliographical handling of *The Christian Doctrine* itself. His treatment of this work when unrelated to other works of Milton is invaluable to the student of Milton bibliography and text. Exceedingly valuable also is his interpretation of a great number of details in *Paradise Lost*, which have hitherto been misunderstood by English scholars. We are undoubtedly under a great debt to Mr. Kelley for his book, and for emphasizing once more that we cannot hope to gain a complete understanding of *Paradise Lost* without constantly consulting *Christian Doctrine*.

As soon, however, as Kelley begins to discuss the relation of *Christian Doctrine* to anything else either in or outside of Milton, one finds the grain and the chaff so inextricably mixed that it would take a fairy godmother to separate them. Nevertheless, the reviewer will attempt to illustrate.

The exceptionally large space given over to parallel passages in *Paradise Lost* and *Christian Doctrine* throw in very many instances light upon the meaning of disputed passages in *Paradise Lost*. His contention, however, that Milton means in his poetry exactly what he means in his prose in each and every instance is preposterous, particularly in view of what Milton expressly declares repeatedly in *Paradise Lost* as to why he has to leave matters in a work of art open to more than one interpretation in poetry.¹ Milton, theologian plus artist, was peculiarly conscious of the necessity for freedom in the treatment of any substance going into a poem. Again, as to the matter of the date of the final form of *Doctrine*, Kelley has assembled valuable data indeed, but realizing that *Christian Doctrine* has to be dated just exactly right in order to count as a determining

*This Great Argument: A Study of Milton's 'De Doctrina Christiana' as a Gloss Upon 'Paradise Lost.' By Maurice Kelley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1941, pp.xiv-269, \$5.00.

influence upon the exact meaning of passages in *Paradise Lost*, he strains to the breaking point his attempt to change conjectures into certainties. At all points we find the excellence of the scholarship qualified by the spirit of the clever advocate and debater. One of the most amusing instances of this is perhaps unconscious. Taylor, he says, showed up all modern source study as unsound. But Taylor's suggested single source is a false source. The right source is, instead of Du Bartas, *Christian Doctrine*. Ergo, Kelley reaps the cream of Taylor's researches. Says Prince Hal to his father, Henry IV,

Hotspur "is but my factor, good my Lord,
To engross up glorious deeds 'on my behalf."

The speciousness of the argument is at once apparent when an examination of Taylor's work shows that he never once maintained that any one of the sources suggested was not a source, but was simply putting in a plea for an ignored source in addition to the other sources already suggested.

One who handles others without gloves must expect to be handled without gloves. Hence it is necessary to notice how Kelley belabors other Milton scholars for not concerning themselves *primarily* with *The Christian Doctrine* in recent years. It may be appropriate to suggest that they have not done so because of the fact that it had already been done, though not exhaustively, very many years ago. It is only fair to say that Mr. Kelley is aware of this himself.² Scholars often prefer to get off the beaten highway into by-paths. Kelley discounts almost entirely the knowledge that contemporary scholars in the field of Milton research have of *The Christian Doctrine*. His remarks about the researches, for example, of Fletcher, Saurat, Greenlaw, Taylor, and Till-yard, suggest that these scholars know little if anything about it. Frank A. Patterson, whose name is not even mentioned by Kelley, and who is to be thanked for making the text (without all the citations) easily accessible to us all, I imagine knows a good deal about *The Christian Doctrine*. More than any other modern scholar, Patterson has compelled us to reckon with *Christian Doctrine* in interpreting *Paradise Lost*. He said in 1933:

We should begin at once to formulate what we believe was Milton's conception of God. To this end it will be well to read through, if time allows, the entire *Christian Doctrine* before starting to study *Paradise Lost*, and then to refer to it continually throughout the reading of the poem.³

And repeatedly in his notes he suggests in detail how *Christian Doctrine* would be examined as explaining *Paradise Lost*. This reviewer, too, for example, although called to account severely for ignorance of *The Christian Doctrine*, made the following statement ten years before the publication of *This Great Argument*, in *Studies in Philology*, XXVIII (1931), 123:

"These are merely a few of the allusions in Shakspere to that elaborately worked out theological scheme of salvation with which Milton in his *Christian Doctrine* and *Paradise Lost* shows such detailed familiarity. Shakspere's knowledge of such matters was surely not scholarly, his allusions not beyond the average playgoer of his day. These matters must have been the commonplace of the age, a fact which those of us working into the new sources of Milton sometimes forget in attempting to establish very definite relations between Milton and those who, like him, use these conventions of the Medieval and Renaissance theologians. What Gilbert demonstrated in his article "Milton and the Mysteries," is doubtless true of many other works or series of works in which scholars are now seeking to find the definite sources of Milton."⁴

One of the reasons, therefore, why the scholars attacked by Kelley have not devoted all their intellectual energies to *Christian Doctrine* is that they were allowing undergraduates with the aid of *Christian Doctrine* as a possible gloss, to work out term papers concerning many of the very points taken up in Mr. Kelley's book, merely as subjects of altercation proper for the exercise of an adolescent's intellect. Kelley joins the ranks of a band of scholars who, without ever having written a single book, do not hesitate to speak without any marked degree of courtesy about men who have written pretty fair books. Fletcher, for example, "fails to understand"; Tillyard is accused of "critical mysticism, unbridled impressionism"; Greenlaw's "failure to recognize in *Paradise Lost* Milton's concept of the manifold nature of the Fall vitiates, if it does not render valueless, the recent studies of the lapse by Greenlaw"; and Taylor in his *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* is "obsessed". A scholar has a right to disagree with any man. But surely it must still be possible even in these rough and ready days, to do this without assuming that the scholar with whom one disagrees is on a low intellectual level.

May I call attention to a most remarkable instance of Kelley's reasoning processes. He thinks that the differences between the theological doctrines of Du Bartas and Milton

prove that Milton was not influenced by Du Bartas.⁵ One might as well contend that when Havens asserts that Blackmore was an imitator, if not a plagiarizer of Milton, that Havens is absurdly wrong because Milton is an Arian and Blackmore never loses an opportunity of confuting Arianism. Taylor is only remotely concerned in *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* in any agreement of Du Bartas and Milton as to hair-splitting distinctions in theology; he is concerned with what Kelley apparently is entirely unaware of, the interest of a *literary* genius in the *literary* expression of one whom he read and remembered. Should we handcuff *Paradise Lost* to *The Christian Doctrine*, we should thereby devise the surest method of cutting Milton off from the intelligent readers of the modern world. Even if *Paradise Lost* agreed line by line with *The Christian Doctrine*, that would have absolutely nothing to do with Milton's reading, liking, and remembering any other books dealing with the same themes.

When a scholar's mind moves on the basis of logic just illustrated, the final conclusions at which he arrives are to be accepted in every case with very decided qualifications.

¹See Gilbert, *MLN.* LV (March, 1940), p. 215.

²See *This Great Argument*, p. 5.

³*The Student's Milton.* "Notes on the Poetry," p. 75.

⁴See further. R. A. Law, "Shakspeare in the Garden of Eden," University of Texas, *Studies in English*, 1941: K.O. Myrick, "The Theme of Damnation in Shaksperian Tragedy," *Studies in Philology*, XXXVIII (April, 1941), 221 ff.

⁵*This Great Argument*, p. 203.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

By S. A. T.

AN IMPORTANT NEW BOOK

Professor Oscar J. Campbell's new book, *Shakespeare's Satire*, published by the Oxford University Press (for \$3.75), is one of the more interesting and one of the sanest books published this year. Dr. Campbell attempts in its pages to enlarge our conception of Shakspere as a satirist; to convince us that in the plays which are generally supposed to betray Shakspere's bitterness, we should look only for a satiric

impulse; that those dramas of his that seem to have been written with a 'harsh critical spirit' were really the results of his imitation of 'a popular literary fashion.' The plays which Professor Campbell studies from this viewpoint are *Love's Labor's Lost*, *As You Like It*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, *Timon of Athens*, *Measure for Measure*, *Troilus and Cressida*, and—most amazing—*Coriolanus*. Other plays, *Henry IV*, *The Merry Wives*, *King John*, *Twelfth Night*, *Romeo and Juliet*, etc., are dis-

cussed incidentally.

Unquestionably there is much in this book of 240 pages (without an index—an unpardonable fault in a scholarly book) with which one acquainted with Shakspere's work will agree, and there is much with which he will not agree. To most readers, we think, Professor Campbell's book will appear as a huge and frail structure built on an untenable conception of the nature of satire and a desire to paint Shakspere as a person interested in problems of political philosophy.

We do not intend to argue these questions; Professor Campbell is entitled to his viewpoint, and arguments on such subjective matters inevitably lead to nothing. But there is one matter connected with his book to which we take serious exception. Professor Campbell ends his preface with the following sentence: "In my quotations of Shakespeare's lines I have followed the text of George Lyman Kittredge's edition of *Shakespeare's Complete Works*." Any standard text would have answered the author's purpose; in not a single instance is his interpretation of a passage in any play dependent on a text which would require Kittredge's support. It is a matter for great astonishment therefore to discover that Dr. Campbell's statement regarding his quotations is woefully and exasperatingly incorrect, probably because of careless copying and incompetent proof-reading—if he really used K's book.

The departures from Kittredge involve not only substitutions of commas for periods, periods for commas, and commas for semicolons, but the omission of hyphens, changes in spelling, the addition of stage-directions, the substitution of words, and the failure to indicate elisions of vowels for metrical reasons. What the eccentric Professor Kittredge's reactions would

have been to these corruptions of his text may well be imagined.

On page 73, in a passage from *2 Henry IV*, (II, iv, 177-83) Dr. Campbell has omitted four of Kittredge's commas, added one, and changed 'packhorses' to 'pack horses'. On p. 104 C reads 'shrewdly' for K's 'shrowdly'; on p. 106 (quotation from *T & C*, III, iii, 251-57) 'an hostess' is changed to 'a hostess' (line 2), 'this' to 'his' (1. 5); on p. 111 'Th' imaginary' is replaced by 'The imaginary'; on p. 112 he omits a necessary comma after 'rub on' and omits the hyphen in 'fee-farm'; on p. 113 he inserts the stage-direction 'aside' after 'Pandarus,' incorrectly; on p. 114 he prints 'thievery' for 'thievry'; on p. 131 a needed punctuation mark is wanting after 'precise'; on p. 153 (1.3, a quotation from a familiar passage in *Hamlet*) 'you nickname' is replaced by 'and nickname'; on p. 154 a quotation is ruined by a period (instead of a comma) after 'bed', and 'Stew'd' is replaced by 'Stewed'; on p. 157 Hamlet's 'forgone' is misrepresented by 'foregone' and 't'his majestical roof' is replaced by 'the majestical roof', 'faculties' by 'faculty', 'and moving by 'in moving'; on p. 161 (the second quotation from *Othello*) 'i'th' is replaced by 'in the'; on p. 164 K's 'art incestuous' is changed to 'are [!] incestuous' and 'in pieces' to 'to pieces'; on p. 165 we have a genuine howler: 'small vices' is replaced by 'great vices' and 'sin' by 'sins'; on p. 171 'an usurer' is changed to 'a usurer'; on p. 207 a passage from *Hamlet* is mangled by the omission of the comma after 'soldier's'; on p. 209 'His heart's his mouth' is spoiled by the reading 'hearts'; on p. 213 't'his child Like him by chance' is converted into 'bis child, Like him by chance'; on p. 52 K's 'gundello' is modernized into 'gondola'.

The above are, of course, only a sampling to illustrate our charge.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XVIII

JULY, 1943

NO. 3

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The <i>Sir Thomas Moore</i> Problem Reconsidered	<i>Paul Deutschberger</i> 99
George Bancroft's View of Shakspere	<i>Russel B. Nye</i> 109
'Nature and Art' in <i>Winter's Tale</i>	<i>Harold S. Wilson</i> 114
Shakspere's Heroic Shrew	<i>Raymond A. Houk</i> 121
Removing a Scar From <i>All's Well</i>	<i>Samuel A. Tannenbaum</i> 133
Sorrow and Love on the Elizabethan Stage	<i>Lawrence Babb</i> 137
Editorial Comment—John Donne and Bibliography	<i>S.A.T.</i> 143

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary
Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE SIR THOMAS MOORE PROBLEM
RECONSIDERED
(Continuation)*

By PAUL DEUTSCHBERGER

The fourth line of argument follows the third rather closely:

Certain ideas were linked in Shakespeare's mind, and this coupling recurs with curious similarity, in spite of differing circumstances: at one time, it may be in an elaborate simile, at another in a single line or word . . . Therefore, if the speech of Sir Thomas More be Shakespeare's, we may reasonably expect More's figures regarding government to reappear . . . in those passages in Shakespeare's undoubtedly works where this question of authority and mob-law is discussed.⁴⁸

This line of argument was subsequently developed by Miss Spurgeon.⁴⁹

Without entering into a discussion of the validity or invalidity of the method in general, we may dismiss seven of Spurgeon's twelve examples of repetition as of no value, inasmuch as the parallel consists only in the occurrence of single words in the compared passages. The relationship, for instance, between Williamson's "Nay yt has infected yt with the palsy . . ." and Lord Say's "The palsy, and not fear provokes me!"⁵⁰ appears only in the repetition of the word "palsy." This is also true of Miss Spurgeon's comparison of "Trash, trash; they breed sore eyes," with Anne's "Out of my sight! Thou dost infect my eyes."⁵¹ But, Miss Spurgeon makes her whole case absurd when she compares "spurne you lyke doggs," with Helena's "Spurn me, strike me,"⁵² Miss Spurgeon's reasoning is, indeed, worthy of Fluellen:

There is a river in Macedon; and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth: it is called Wye at Monmouth; but it is out of my prains what is the name of the other river; but 'tis all one, 'tis alike as my fingers is to my fingers, and there is salmons in both.⁵³

The logical fallacies involved in Miss Spurgeon's method in general have been brilliantly exposed by Miss Lillian Hornstein,⁵⁴ and we need not discuss them here.

However, of more importance in the *Moore* case, are the following images: (1) "While they ar ore the banck of their

*The footnotes for this section will be found in the April issue of the BULLETIN.

obedience/ thus will they bere downe all things" (line 50); (2) "and you in ruff of your opinions clothd" (line 94); (3) "other ruffians . . . woold shark on you and men lyke ravenous fishes/ woold feed on on another" (line 99); (4) "to the king god hath his offyc lent, *etc.*," (lines 116ff); (5) "and leade the maiestie of law in liom/to slipp him lyke a hound" (lines 143-144).

But it is not enough to point out that somewhat similar figures appear in Shakspere's acknowledged works. Miss Spurgeon must demonstrate that their appearance in *Moore* and in Shakspere has some significance. That the significance of these so-called repetitions has not been shown follows from the following considerations: a) some of these, *e.g.*, "spurne you lyke doggs," are mere clichés of Elizabethan literary usage; b) the others rest on mistaken interpretations of the words used by Shakspere and by D.

Consider, for instance, figure (4). Moore says,

for to the king god hath his offyc lent
of dread of iustyce, power and commaund
hath bid him rule, and willd you to obay
and to add ampler maiestie to this
he hath not only lent the king his figure
his throne and sword, but gyven him his owne name
calls him a god on earth . . .

Miss Spurgeon is not, we hope, serious when she brings in Hamlet's "In the same figure, like the king that's dead,"⁵⁵ and "Poor key-cold figure of a holy king!"⁵⁶

But, on the other hand, the Bishop of Carlisle approaches Moore's thought:

The figure of God's majesty,
His Captain, Steward, Deputy elect⁵⁷;
but the Bishop, here as elsewhere, has resorted to a political
platitudine. Calvin's *Institutio* endlessly repeats the idea that
"on ne peut pas résister aux magistratz sans résister à Dieu."⁵⁸
It was Calvin, too, who remarshalled the scriptural admoni-
tions against opposing the king⁵⁹; Moore's

first tis a sinn
which oft thappostle did forwarne vs of
vrging obedience to authorty.

*The footnotes for this section will be found in the April issue of the BULLETIN.

Cheke, as we have seen, uses Moore's argument in the same way. Hooper declared that the "office of a magistrate is the ordinance of God,"⁶⁰ and Gardiner emphasized that "The King, yea, though he be an infidel, represententh the image of God on earth."⁶¹ The 1550 edition of Gregory Nazianzen's *Oratio* carried the following admonition:

Presume not ye that are sheep to make yourselves guides of them that guide you . . . It suffices for your part . . . to be ordered. Take it not upon yourselves to judge the judges . . .

Robert Crowley versified the idea as follows:

But if thou do lyfte up thy sword
Agaynst thy kynge and soueraine,
Then art thou iuged by Gods word
As worthi therwith to be slayne . . .

For it is God that appointeth
Kinges and rulers ouer the route:
And with his power he anointeth
Them for to be obeyede, no doubte.
. . . God hym selfe doth princis call
Hys christes and hys annoynted.

Whoso therefore doth them resisteth,
The same resisteth God certayne.⁶²

There is no difficulty in showing how conventional every image in this portion of Moore's speech really is; that is, all but two. D seems to have garbled the idea a bit in "offyc of dread of iustyce." The second "of" seemingly having been thrown in to make the line conform to metre. The other, the one which gives Miss Spurgeon so much trouble, is "lent his figure." This is rather meaningless, if not absurd, unless D is merely restating the formula "*princeps est animata lex*," used by Aegidus Romanus at the end of the thirteenth century.⁶³

Moore's "and that you sitt as kings in your desyres" repeats Cheke's "Be yee Kings?"⁶⁴ and reflects Crowley's

He would have told the that to reuenge wronges is, in a subiect, to take and vsurp the office of a kinge, and, consequently, the office of God. For the king is Goddes minister to reuenge the wronges done vnto the innocent.⁶⁷

Or consider the figure, "and you in the ruff of your opynyon clothd," which Spurgeon compares to Gratiano's
dress'd in an opinion
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit.⁶⁶

It is true that these two images are similar—but that, in itself, is no proof of identity of authorship. The same idea is repeated in Hugh Latimer:

Where is all thy pompe? Wher is all
the ruffe of thy gloriousnes become?⁶⁷

Both Chambers and Spurgeon compare Moore's
and leade the maiestie of law in liom
to slipp him lyke a hound,
to Martius'

Holding Corioli in the name of Rome
Even like a fawning greyhound in the leash
To let him slip at will.⁶⁸

The word "slip" is common to both. But this is one of the commonest idioms of Elizabethan venery. It is difficult to apply the meaning of the *Coriolanus* quotation (either to loose the greyhound at a particular object, or to let the dog go off as he pleases—depending upon how "at will" is interpreted) to the *Moore* image. Chambers apparently realized this, for he appended the qualifying statement,

Now, as has been pointed out above, the rebels in *Sir Thomas More*
are not disloyal to the king.

But this is in flat contradiction to the text. One of Moore's strongest arguments is that the rebels *are* disloyal to the king, and, consequently to God.

The obvious explanation is that "to slip" and "to let slip" are different verbs. The *N.E.D.* tells us that "a slip" is a synonym for "leash." To "slip" the law is, as Moore says, to "lead it in liom."

Chambers and Spurgeon make much of Moore's observation,

whiles they ar ore the banck of their obedienc
thus will they bere down all things.

They find many parallels to this in the acknowledged works of Shakspere. But, on folio 5a (in the hand of Mundy), Surrey uses the same figure:

this tyde of rage, that with the Eddie striues:
I feare me much, will drowne too manie liues. (lines 62-63)

On the same page, he calls the importunings of the aliens, "high-crested insolence" (line 12).

The figure was common enough during the sixteenth century. It may be found in Ascham:

disobedience doth overflow the banks of good order almost in every place, almost in every degree of man.⁶⁹

The last image we must consider is the one given most prominence by Chambers—"the cannibal monsters." Moore says

other ruffians . . .
woold shark on you, and men lyke ravenous fishes
woold feed on on other.

Ulysses, in *Troilus and Cressida*, declares,

And appetite, an universal wolf, . . .
Must make perforce an universal prey,
And last eat up himself.

Coriolanus makes use of the same half line,

You cry against the noble senate, who
Under the gods, keep you in awe, which else
Would feed on one another.⁷⁰

But this is not so conclusive as one might be led to believe. The idea is an old and popular one. Take, for instance, the rather strong word, "ravenous." Hall's *Chronicle*, in treating the Ill May-Day, calls the aliens "ravener."⁷¹ Since this *Chronicle* was the source for the early scenes of the play, it may be assumed that the very word suggested the image to D; which image was not peculiar to Shakspere. It was a sixteenth century commonplace to compare the greedy clergy to wolves consuming God's flock. So Latimer puts it in a rather scrambled figure:

Beware of false Prophetes, which come vnto you in shewes clothing,
but inwardly they are rauening woulfes, yee shall know them by their
frutes.⁷²

Simon Fish speaks, indeed, with that intensity that Chambers could find only in Shakspere:

Ye(a) who is abill to nombre the greate and brode botomles ocean
see full of euilles that this mischeuous and sinful generacion may
laufly bring vppon vs vnponnished. Where is youre swerde, power,
cowne, and dignitie, become that shulde punishe . . . the felonies,
rapes, murdres, and treasons committed by this sinful generacion?
. . . Oh the greuous shipwrek of the comon welth, which yn auncient
time bifore the coming yn of these rauinous wolve was so pros-
perous.⁷³

The image itself became secularized, the term "wolf" being applied rather broadly, while the idea of "cannibal monsters" became somewhat of a cliché. *The Supplication of the Poore Commons*, 1546, admonishes King Henry:

Remember that you shal not leaue this kyngedome to a straunger, but to that child of great towardnes our most natural Prince Edward; employ your study to leaue hym a Commune Weale to gourne, and not an island of brute beastes, amongste whom the strongest deuour the weaker.⁷⁴

Of interest, too, is Grimald's poem on "Lawes." The whole sounds like an epitome of Moore's speech. Notice the comparison of the mob to a wild beast (in this case, the tiger); the use of a variation of the "law in liom" image; and a half-developed reference to the unruly waters figure.

When princes lawes, with reverend right do keep ye commons under
As meek as babes, thei do their charge, and scatter not asunder.
But if they raise their heads aloft, and lawe her brydle slake:
Then, lyke a tyger fell they fare, and lust for law they take.
Where water doth prevail, and fire, no mercy they expresse:
But yet the rage of that rude rout is much more mercilesse.⁷⁵

Crowley, too, sees "cannibal monsters" in civil disorder:

Cormerauntes, gredye gulles; yea men that would eat up menne,
women, & chyldren, are the causes of sedition.⁷⁶

Certainly, a reference to "cannibal monsters" in Elizabethan literature is no proof of Shakspere's hand. It is interesting to conjecture, in fact, that in *Troilus and Cressida* Shakspere may have borrowed the image from Montaigne's *Essays*:

Every one must not have the knowledge of his dutie referred to his owne judgment . . . induce us (as Epicurus saith) to endeavor to destroy and devour one another. The first law that ever God gave unto man, was a law of pure obedience.⁷⁷ Epicurus said of the lawes, that the worst were so necessary unto us, that without them men would enter devoure one another. And Plato verifieth that without lawes we should be like beastes.⁷⁸

But Montaigne's *Essays* seems to have played a large part in Shakspere's thought only after Florio's translation in 1603; the date of *Troilus and Cressida* is but a decade after 'Sir Thomas Moore.'

The idea was common enough during the Renaissance,

however. But there seems to be a difference between Moore's use of the image and Ulysses'. Moore's "ravenous fishes" refer, like Cheke's "frantick beasts," to men who have fallen to savagery. Ulysses' "universal wolf" is obviously a repetition of the general medieval symbol for the sins of the flesh, *i.e.*, self-love and avarice. Compare Dante's "*maledetto lupo, consuma dentro te con la tua rabbia*"⁷⁹ . . . *Maledetta sii tu, antica lupa che più che tutte l'altre bestie hai preda, per la tua fame senza fine cupa!*"⁸⁰

This wolf-symbol can be traced to two popular sources of the Renaissance. In Plautus we find it expressed succinctly enough,

*lupus est homo homini.*⁸¹

This symbol seems to have been given its allegorical meaning by the bestiaries. The *Manuelis Philae* gives the following:

non lupus sed agnus esse videatur in mediis gregibus.
. . . Quum autem breve collum extremo dorso gerat,
*inflectit corpus ipsum.*⁸²

It is obvious how ferocious the middle ages took the wolf to be, believing that Providence gave the wolf its short neck so that it might not bite itself!

Höhna⁸³ is only one of the many scholars who have pointed out how much the bestiaries influenced Elizabethan literature, especially Euphuism. So Lyly presents the concept in a little saw:

For true it is, . . . that it must be a hard winter when one wolf eateth another.⁸⁴

As to the verb, "to shark," which according to the *N.E.D.* occurs for the first two times in *Moore* and in *Hamlet*, and which, consequently, Chambers quotes to sustain the theory of Shakspere's identity with D; as Schücking has already shown,⁸⁵ "to shark" in *Hamlet* means "to gather"; in *Moore*, something like "to feed upon."

But the *N.E.D.* is not complete nor wholly dependable in such questions.⁸⁶ Charles E. Palmer, *quondam* editor on the staff of the *Early Modern English Dictionary*, has turned up many examples of "to shark" and its derivatives, used in D's sense, before 1615, which are not included in the *N.E.D.* The

most interesting example he gives is a phrase from Ben Jonson that antedates the *Hamlet* quotation:

What? will I turne sharke, upon my friends?⁸⁷

Professor Palmer notes that "a comma before rather than after 'shark' in this passage would make it a verb."⁸⁸ Even without transposing the comma, the meaning of the sentence is clear. This quotation alone makes it apparent that "to shark" was not the coinage and the monopoly of Shakspere. By 1604, the year in which *The Dutch Courtesan* was produced, "to shark" had become part of slang usage:

Freevill: Nay, comfort, my good host Shark, my good Mulligrub.⁸⁹

Malheureux: Nay, be not jaw-fall'n, my most sharking Mulligrub.⁹⁰

Another instance will suffice to show how foolish Chambers's argument sometimes becomes. He compares Moore's "give your selfe vp to forme" with Menenius' "where he shall answer by a lawful form." The hit or miss comparison of the same word used in different ways is characteristic of this whole phase of the *Moore* argument. "Form" (*i.e.* order) and "lawful form" (prescribed documents and procedures) are obviously two different things.

Chambers's and Spurgeon's arguments may therefor be dismissed from further serious consideration.

VII

The last point to consider in the aesthetic argument is the alleged similarity of the treatment of the common people in *Sir Thomas Moore* and in Shakspere. Chambers tells us that "even in his ridicule of humble folk, Shakspere generally shows a loving touch."⁹¹ But Dekker, Heywood, and Haughton exhibit this same attitude. Grimald, much earlier than these, treats the masses with a broad good humor derived from the tradition of Plautus. Notice, for instance, his presentation of Dromo, Dorus, Sangax, and Brumax, in *Christus Redivivus*. Heywood, as Schücking pointed out, repeats the two remarks of Doll Williamson which Chambers finds so Shaksperian.⁹² If we are to use this criterion, we shall have to assume, too, that Frisco, in Haughton's *Englishmen For My Money* (*c.* 1598), was a creation of Shakspere.

But, is there anything in the treatment of the common people in the Addition, that is unShaksperian? For his presentation of the lower middle-class Shakspere follows the same tradition as did Grimald. Shakspere's crowds, seemingly, are always conscious of their own good humor. Not only do they make extended use of puns, as in *Julius Caesar*, I, i; but as in the Jack Cade scenes of *Henry VI*, they make their fellows ridiculous by making side-remarks about one another:

Cade: We John Cade, so termed of our supposed father,—

Dick: (aside) Or rather, of stealing a cade of herrings. . . .

Cade: My wife descended of the Lacies,—

Dick: (aside) She was, indeed, a pedlar's daughter and sold many laces.⁹⁸

For one thing, there is a complete absence of such humor in D's scene. The pun and the *double-entendre*, the hallmarks of Shakspere's hand, are missing, as well as the sarcastic and revelatory asides.

Secondly, Shakspere's mobs are never irrelevant. The crowd may be whimsical, but not in the sense that Doll is. Shakspere's mobs are not composed of fools and are not easily hoodwinked. The citizens in *Coriolanus*, no matter how they say it, insist upon their grievances; the aristocracy has been withholding food and has been robbing them usuriously. But in D's scene the crowd forgets its grievances. The appalling injustices of the aliens, the corruption of the English officials, are passed over in favor of the complaint about "straing rootes." The rioters are, as Chambers says, "absurd and illogical," but not more so than Moore himself. Moore's Golden Rule homily is entirely uncalled for. Fraunces de Barde has assaulted Doll; he has captured "the goldsmithes wife . . . (and) madste him (like an asse) pay for his wifes boorde."⁹⁹⁴ The Lord Mayor has sent Williamson to jail on complaint of the French Ambassador.⁹⁹⁵ Moore ignores all this. He asks the rioters to place themselves in the position of the "wretched straingers." Incredibly as it may seem, the crowd is convinced:

All: Fayth a saies trewe letts do as we may be doon by.

In *Julius Caesar* both Brutus and Anthony stick to the sub-

ject in addressing the mob. Menenius, in *Coriolanus*, does so. Chambers tells us that in Moore's speech the "obvious thing to have dwelt upon would have been the fear of punishment and the hope of pardon." The obvious thing for Moore to have said, of course, was that the king would right the people's wrongs.

We must, therefore, reject *in toto* the arguments of Chambers, Spurgeon, and the others. The aesthetic case cannot be taken seriously; it carries no more conviction in its most highly articulate form than the original naive statements of Simpson and Spedding. By their methods as good a case could be made out for Marlowe,⁹⁶ Drayton,⁹⁷ Heywood, Haughton,⁹⁸ and others of Shakspere's contemporaries.

[*To be concluded*]

GEORGE BANCROFT'S VIEW OF SHAKSPERE

BY RUSSEL B. NYE

GEORGE BANCROFT was known to his time and is remembered by ours chiefly as the most renowned of the nineteenth century historians of the United States. A man of a wide range of interests, he successfully combined a career as politician and diplomat with that of a man of letters, and at one time, before the plan for his monumental *History* had crystallized in his mind, he contemplated a career as a literary critic. Accounted one of Harvard's most promising undergraduates, he was sent abroad by the college after his graduation in 1817 to pursue theological studies at Göttingen and other German universities. After his return in 1822, he spent some months as a tutor of Greek at Harvard, relinquishing his position to join Joseph Cogswell in founding the experimental secondary school near Northampton, Massachusetts, called Round Hill. During the early years of the decade he spent at Round Hill he established a fortunate connection with the *North American Review*, then edited by Jared Sparks, and met with such success as a reviewer that he considered abandoning school-teaching for the life of a professional critic.

Most of Bancroft's early critical work was done in the field of German literature, since he had read widely during his Göttingen years and was therefore one of the best informed Americans in German letters. He had, however, a broad foundation in the English classics, and, as could be expected, constantly drew upon his knowledge of the English literary tradition for illustration and comparison. In the first volume of his *History*, published in 1834, he gave several pages to a brief account of Elizabethan letters in sketching the early background of colonial America, mentioning more than twenty Elizabethan writers and in general displaying a competent acquaintance with Elizabethan literature. Shakspere, in particular, fascinated him, and in the essays and reviews he published in the journals between 1824 and 1835, he frequently commented on Shakspere's genius and held his art as the standard of excellence.

Bancroft's comments on Shakspere reflected the bias of

his own mind during his formative years. It is not to be forgotten that he had originally prepared himself for the ministry, and his judgments of Shakspere were at first concerned almost solely with the "moral effect and moral justice" of his plays. In a series of three articles written for the *American Quarterly Review* in 1827 and 1828, he pointed out that in German literature, and in Goethe in particular, vice and immorality were often presented without compensatory punishment; this was never the case, he affirmed, in Shakspere, who never presented vice "clothed with beauty." "Vice has no beauty," he wrote in a review of Mrs. Hemans' poetry in 1827, "and for the poet to invest it with such is a violation of his trust." Shakspere was always moral, he concluded; *Macbeth* and *Richard III* exhibited true moral justice, that is, "the power of vice to degrade." Shakspere, though he was "the most powerful of all poets in delineating the passions," yet gave in his plays the great example of "the wedding of beauty and moral justice in art."

But as Bancroft's interests turned from theology and ethics toward history and politics, his concept of Shakspere changed accordingly. In 1834 the first volume of his *History*, a highly democratic work, appeared, "voting for Jackson," one critic said. Shakspere now became not the great ethical teacher, but the great democrat, the artist of the common man. The common people were the highest earthly tribunal in matters of art, he told the students of Williams College in 1835; literature became great only when it drew inspiration and sustenance from the masses. Dante, Homer, Chaucer, and others were great because their art was rooted in the common people, but the greatest artist of all, "poet of mankind," was Shakspere, whose genius was purely democratic, whose art drew from the common people and was inspired by them.

The success of his historical volumes led Bancroft to forsake literary criticism for a career as a historian. Half a century later, however, his *History* nearly completed, he returned to Shakspere. In 1883, when Bancroft was eighty-three, he confided to Edward Everett Hale that he planned

to write a critical biography of Shakspere. He intended, he said, to dwell on three major points: that Shakspere knew he was a natural genius and that he determined early in life to become a great poet; that he set about industriously preparing himself to that end, learning his craft; and that by hard work and preparation he attained his goal with *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *Lear*. He was, therefore in Bancroft's estimation, a *natural* genius who fulfilled the promise of his great gifts by learning and labor—an interesting blend of the romantic and neoclassic views common to the nineteenth century conception of Shakspere's development.

The projected book was never written, for when the last edition of the *History* appeared Bancroft was nearing ninety and was no longer capable of the necessary sustained intellectual effort. He began, however, making scattered notes for the volume, notes now preserved in the New York Public Library collection of Bancroft papers. One page of his notebook, for example, shows the following:

"Shakespeare came out of Stratford independent in thought, not a skeptic but a bold inquirer after truth. He went to London with character formed, an orderly, regular man.

His philosophy was wherever it touched religion in him—reason won the victory over superstition. His mind tranquil—he never wrestled with doubt.

Shakespeare, like Plato and Vergil, was the representative of order and authority.

Not skeptical though he read Montaigne.

Never seems to be straining or making effort. He improves not by consulting faults but by obtaining a more complete mastery and use and skill in the employment of his powers. *Twelfth Night*, Maria's speech, Act III, Sc. II, 64-65, is expression of the Calvinistic doctrine of Salvation by Faith, and Sir Andrew's contemptuous reference to the Brownists in same act and scene."

Most illuminating, however, of the items in Bancroft's papers, is an unfinished three-page essay, evidently a summary or prospectus of his proposed biography, which combined both the moral and the political strains of his early view of Shakspere.

"Shakespeare represented all classes of English society, and although he might raise a smile with regard to some no party which had dignity and character failed to obtain his respect and recognition.

He was versed in the theology of the Calvinists, but when he brought the Calvinists on the stage he chose for the representative a man of perfect courage and spotless morality and purity of life, namely, Cassius [!]. Cassius, when by the treason of his enemy, had been betrayed into a momentary disposition to error, showed that he himself with his great severity of morals and spotless character, was a Calvinist, and the great author introduces him when half drunk and tottering, meditating on the fine points of Calvinism, especially on predestination.

The pious young person in one of the comedies, who is brought in with no other view than that he was too much given to prayer, is a representative not of the Calvinists, but of another class; it may be a sectarianist, but more probably of persons who were attached to the Church of England who had some peculiar tendencies to religion. With regard to Shakespeare, it has been the fashion, when some play of his of a later date appeared with enlargements or emendations, to go to work to question as to who it could possibly be that made the change; but Shakespeare always had an eye to making editions himself of his own works and nobody but himself would venture to change them. Undoubtedly the allusion to America in the tribute to King James was written by Shakespeare's own hand and from his own knowledge too about Virginia, and as regards the shipwreck of the leader of the colonial expedition, it taught Shakespeare to write *The Tempest*, so that America has a double connection with him; first by his prediction that the English in North America would make a new nation, and next by his play of *The Tempest*. Shakespeare's connection with the woman he was to marry, or whom in consequence of that connection he did marry, was, when made, complete and lasting, and from that day there is never a word said of his wandering from his wife. There is in all that has been said about Shakespeare not one single word that goes to charge him with any love adventure with any woman whatsoever. That they lived together is proved by the birth of children to them. When it came to the end of his life, who were there to comfort Shakespeare? The wife of his youth and his daughter, the child of his premature love, who turned out to have one of the best minds of any woman in England of her time; to have been the most devoted daughter to the mother and without a doubt to Shakespeare himself. . . . This daughter left to posterity a name for filial piety. So this first, earliest, and only love of Shakespeare brought to him offspring that comforted him during his life and soothed him when dying, and took care of the wife after his death. There could be no instance of a more united family. There is not a scrap of even morose speech that casts a shade on Shakespeare as a husband and father. Of the tales that have been gotten up about Shakespeare's immorality after his marriage, all are modern concoctions. Hallam is the most considerable person in literature who lent his name to these slanders on Shakespeare.

The view of Shakspere that Bancroft meant to adopt, had he continued and completed his critical biography, is clearly implied in this summary and in his remarks to Hale. The picture of the dramatist he would have drawn would have been that of a sober, orderly, conservative artist, gifted by nature with great powers which he developed and matured through practice and study. It would have been, no doubt, a romantic and somewhat moralistic survey of Shakspere's life and works, with a prevailingly ethical and theological emphasis. Had he begun his task fifty years before, Bancroft's volume would have been in harmony with the contemporary interest in morality in art, and it would have been, no doubt, an interesting and significant contribution to early nineteenth-century Shaksperian criticism. When he ultimately turned to the field of literary criticism, however, the trend of opinion regarding Shakspere had shifted, and the fund of authentic information concerning the poet had increased far beyond Bancroft's knowledge and capacity. The surviving fragment, however uncertain its scholarship and didactic its approach, yet retains a certain antiquarian interest by reason of its distinguished authorship.

Michigan State College.

'NATURE AND ART' IN *WINTER'S TALE*
IV, iv, 86 ff.

BY HAROLD S. WILSON

THE passage in *The Winter's Tale* (IV, iv, 79 ff.) where Polixenes and Perdita discuss the merits of such 'artificial' flowers as carnations and gillyvors¹ has been widely and justly admired. It is one of the most graceful and poetic passages in Shakspere and contains one of his keenest intellectual *aperçus*. Over and above the pastoral charm of the setting, Perdita herself, and the fragrant talk of country flowers, there is a pretty ambiguity in the action. As Furness has noted², Polixenes in defending the art of grafting has unknowingly stated the relation between his royal son and the shepherd maid with his metaphor of marrying a gentler scion to the wildest stock, and Perdita cheerfully assents to the figure, if not to the application Polixenes intends; while the audience, familiar with the play and secure in the knowledge that Perdita is a true princess, after all, enjoys the further irony of the maid's accepting the partly false analogy to justify her marriage with Florizel, urged by the man who mistakenly thinks he has most interest in opposing the match.

Polixenes' defence of the carnations and gillyvors which Perdita disdains:

Perdita: For I have heard it said
There is an art which in their piedness shares
With great creating Nature.

Polixenes: Say there be;
Yet Nature is made better by no mean
But Nature makes that mean; so, over that art,
Which you say adds to Nature, is an art
That Nature makes. You see, sweet maid, we marry
A gentler scion to the wildest stock,
And make conceive a bark of baser kind
By bud of nobler race: this is an art
Which does mend Nature, change it rather, but
The art itself is Nature

is couched in terms of one of the many 'nature and art' relationships familiar in ancient and Renaissance literature. No

commentator could hope to canvass the background of Shakspere's idea completely. To exhaust even a fraction of the relevant parallels in the literature preceding Shakspere would require volumes, as everyone knows. Nevertheless, surprisingly few parallels for the passage as a whole have been noted by the commentators, so far at least as I have observed³; and it may be worthwhile to indicate something of their antiquity and extent.

The earlier history of the conception of 'nature' as subsuming the arts of man has been traced by A. O. Lovejoy and George Boas in their indispensable study, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*. As they have remarked, Shakspere's thought is adumbrated though not unequivocally anticipated in a saying attributed to Democritus: "Nature and culture are much alike; for culture changes a man, but through this change makes nature."⁴ A clearer parallel for Shakspere's conception occurs in one of the answers Plato supplies to the sophistic antithesis of 'nature' and 'art'; "Law itself . . . and art . . . exist by nature or by a cause not inferior to nature, since, according to right reason, they are the offspring of mind."⁵ Lovejoy and Boas have likewise noted at length the occurrence of the conception that 'nature' comprehends 'art' in Aristotle⁶ and Cicero.⁷ Other such classical antecedents of Polixenes' thought could be supplied, but probably enough have been indicated to show that the idea of 'art' as a part of cosmic nature or as made by nature was commonplace in antiquity. It would be likewise possible to cite a multitude of pre-Shaksperian parallels for this commonplace from many fields of Renaissance thought. I shall confine my citations to the field of literary theory, with which I am most familiar, and conclude with one which Shakspere may have had in mind when he formulated the speech of Polixenes.

The idea of cosmic nature as guiding and controlling the development of poetic art occurs in Petrarch: "Nihil nisi naturae consentaneum lex poetica fingi sivit"⁸; and this normative conception of 'nature' is further applied to all literary art and to human arts in general by a succession of Renaissance writers in Italy, France, and England.⁹ Some discussion of the relations between 'art' and 'nature'—usually

designed to justify the conceptions of the 'arts' of rhetoric or poetry and to define their limits—became a conventional part of most Renaissance treatises on literary theory. Thus Bernardino Daniello opens his *Poetica* (1536) with a discourse on this matter in which, after granting that "every art and science has its beginnings from nature" (p. 4), he argues that the writer's 'natural' gifts should be supplemented, disciplined, and perfected by the literary 'art' with which his little book is mainly concerned. In support, he introduces an agricultural illustration in something like Polixenes' vein, if not in application to his precise contention. Many things in nature, says Daniello, are improved by human art, and not least the useful products of the soil:

"For nature produces what is useful to human life mixed indiscriminately with thorns and brambles. Wherefore, if the diligent cultivator does not root out the sterile offenders from the good and useful growths, he will reap many tares and but little corn or oats. But let us look a little higher, from the products of the soil to the trees. Do we not here find, very often, something comparable? Assuredly, since, for the most part, trees are apt to degenerate and bring forth sour or insipid fruit if left to their own development. But if these are diligently and artfully grafted with the proper scions of other fruit trees, the fruits become sweet and savory..."¹⁰

Daniello's talk on tree-grafting is not so specific and neatly turned as Polixenes'; but it shows how examples drawn from arboriculture, as from other fields, were associated with Renaissance discussions of 'art' and 'nature' well before Shakspere's time.

A French parallel for Shakspere's generalization concerning 'nature' and 'art' appears in the *Art Poétique* (1555) of Jacques Peletier, the most judicious critic of the Pléiade group. Peletier displays an awareness, unusual for the time, of the ambiguities in the terms 'nature' and 'art' as commonly used by Renaissance theorists. He opens his discussion of these concepts with the following observation:

"If one should take 'nature' in the amplest sense as that great working principle which acts universally upon everything in the world and upon all that falls within the cognizance of men, which comprehends even those things that we call "contrary to nature" or 'supernatural'; then there is only 'nature' . . . in the world . . ."¹¹

In English literary treatises of the Renaissance the commonplaces of ancient and modern continental critics con-

cerning 'art' and 'nature' regularly recur. Among these, the idea that 'nature' generates and regulates 'art' is implied in Sidney's remark about the courtly amateur among poets who, ignorant of the prescriptions of the learned on poetics and merely "following that which by practise hee findeth fittest to nature, therein (though he know it not) doth according to Art though not by art."¹² The idea that "Nature . . . is above all Arte" Shakspere could have found in Samuel Daniel's *Defence of Ryme* (1603), had he needed to.¹³ More interesting, however, is the conjecture that Shakspere's remarks about 'nature' and 'art' in *The Winter's Tale* may have had some relation to the elaborate discussion of these concepts in the *Arte of English Poesie* (1589). The author of this treatise, most probably identified by the latest editors as George Puttenham,¹⁴ is distinguished among Renaissance critics for his semantic interests and his nice discriminations in the use of words. Throughout his treatise he delights in particularizing fine distinctions of critical terminology; and he reserves for his last chapter a discourse on current uses of the terms 'nature' and 'art' and the illustration of their exact employment in criticism.¹⁵

By way of showing "where arte ought to appeare, and where not, and when the naturall is more commendable than the artificiall in any humane action or workmanship," Puttenham distinguishes six different relations between 'nature' and 'art': (1) 'art' as "an aide and coadiutor to nature, and a furtherer of her actions to good effect, or peradventure a meane to supply her wants, by reenforcing the causes wherein shee is impotent and defective"; (2) 'art' as "not only an aide and coadiutor to nature in all her actions, but an alterer of them, and in some sort a surmounter of her skill, so as by meanes of it her owne effects shall appeare more beautiful or straunge and miraculous"; (3) 'art' as "onely a bare immitatour of natures works, following and counterfeyting her actions and effects"; (4) 'art' as "an encounterer and contrary to nature, producing effects neither like to hers, nor by participation with her operations, nor by imitation of her paternes, but makes things and produceth effects altogether strange and diverse, & of such forme & qualitie (nature alwaies supplying stiffe) as she never would

nor could have done of her selfe"; (5) those actions which are "so naturall & proper to man, as he may become excellent therein without any arte or imitation at all"; (6) those arts and methods "by which the naturall is in some sort relieved . . . in his imperfection, but not made more perfit then the naturall."¹⁶

Among the many illustrations of these distinctions Puttenham uses, several come from agriculture. One, in particular, illustrating 'art' as an alterer and surmounter of nature's skill, might have provided the very text of the debate between Perdita and Polixenes:

"And the Gardiner by his arte will not onely make an herbe, or flowr. or fruite, come forth in his season without impediment, but also will embellish the same in vertue, shape, odour and taste, that nature of her selfe woulde never have done: as to make the single gillifloure, or marigold, or daisie, double: and the white rose, redde, yellow, or carnation; a bitter mellon sweete, a sweete apple, soure; a plumme or cherrie without a stone; a peare without core or kernell, a goord or coucumber like to a horne, or any other figure he will: any of which things nature could not doe without mans help and arte."

It is precisely such 'arte' against which Perdita objects and which Polixenes so neatly justifies by pointing out the master generalization that Puttenham's discussion had overlooked.

Puttenham's treatise enjoyed a high reputation, in fashionable literary circles especially, during Shakspere's later years, and beyond; and the solemn didacticism of its author's concluding chapter may have drawn Shakspere's amused attention. It would be in keeping with the quality of Shakspere's wit to play lightly upon Puttenham's theme and provide a summary comment upon it, delivered with the grave urbanity of a Polixenes, a comment which should supply its main deficiency in philosophical insight.¹⁷

Puttenham's principal aim in his discussion of 'nature' and 'art' was to distinguish the bases for a description of the poet's activity and art, to analyze rather than to generalize; and this aim he fulfilled very well. Nor would Shakspere's comment have seemed to any thoughtful and educated contemporary, including Puttenham himself, unfamiliar. But

it represents, perhaps, as well as any passage can, the supreme power of Shakspere to see the main issue and to comment upon it with unequalled felicity.

Whether or not the conjectured link with Puttenham's treatise be acceptable, we may conclude that Shakspere's thought was commonplace both in antiquity and in the Renaissance, and that even the horticultural illustrations Shakspere uses were familiar in Renaissance discussions of 'nature' and 'art' long before Shakspere's time. Shakspere's originality is not in his matter but in his art, which, as Dryden and Doctor Johnson long ago observed, is the 'art' of 'nature' itself.

220 *Andrews Hall*
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska.

¹On the propriety of this spelling, see *The Winter's Tale, A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, ed. H. H. Furness, Philadelphia, 1898, p. 189.

²*Ibid.*, p. 191.

³Sir Wm. T. Thiselton-Dyer in *Shakespeare's England* (1. 514) has cited a passage from Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum* on the cultivation of gilly-flowers and contrasts the superior insight of Shakspere in anticipating the view of recent botanists "that nature contains the secret of its own evolution." See also the notes to the Cambridge *Shakespeare*, ed. Quiller-Couch and Wilson. H. N. Hudson (*The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, with . . . notes by H. N. Hudson, I. Gollancz, C. H. Herford . . . N. Y., n.d.) has cited parallels in Bacon and Sir Thomas Browne for "art itself is nature." The philosopher S. Alexander (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, July, 1927, pp. 256-72) has used *WT*, IV, iv, 79 ff. as the text for a discourse on the use of the concepts 'nature' and 'art' in aesthetics and the criticism of the fine arts, but he is not concerned to place the Shakspere passage in its historical setting. See also note 17, below.

⁴Frag. 33 (Diels). See Lovejoy and Boas, *Prim.*, pp. 207-08. The authors suggest that the verb-form *phusopoei* in Democritus's saying 'possibly comes close to: 'it carries on the creative work of nature'."

⁵*Laws*, 890 D; trans. R. G. Bury (London and N. Y., 1926). Cf. *Prim.*, p. 166. A different though related view is contained in Pindar's often-repeated assertion that all human excellences, including recognized arts like poetry, are, in the nature of things, innate and hereditary (*Ol.* II, 86-88; *IX*, 100-04; *Pyth.* VIII, 44-45; etc.). Here the purpose is to exalt the native excellence and prerogative of a hereditary aristocracy in contrast with the acquired and therefore allegedly inferior accomplishments of the *parvenus*. The notion that all human arts and excellences are simply or primarily a matter of 'nature' (i.e., native endowment or ability) remained current throughout antiquity—as it still is in some quarters, today—though so indiscriminate an accounting for excellent human achievements was more commonly rejected by thoughtful writers, e.g., Isocrates, *Anisidosis*, 197 f.; Cicero, *De Or.*, I, 83, 90, etc.; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.*, II, xvii, 5 f.; *Per Hapsous*, II, i.

⁶*Prim.*, pp. 189-90. Cf. also "Appendix: Some Meanings of 'Nature'", p. 448 (senses 13, 14, 15).

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 247 f.

⁸*Fam.*, IX, 4. A familiar mediaeval view, as stated, e.g., in Dante,
natura lo suo corso prende

Dal divino intelletto e da sua arte (*Inf.*, xi, 99-100)

and often repeated through the Renaissance, is not, of course, meant to controvert the idea of cosmic nature as subsuming human arts but simply to align 'nature' in its most inclusive sense under the supreme sovereignty of God.

⁹For citations, see my study of the meanings of 'nature' in Renaissance literary theory, *JHI*, II (1941), 430 f., senses 9, 10, 11, 12.

¹⁰*Poetica* (1536), p. 5.

¹¹*Art Poët.*, p. 73.

¹²G. G. Smith, *Elizabethan Critical Essays*. Oxford, 1904, I, 203.

¹³*Ibid.*, II, 359.

¹⁴*The Arte of English Poesie* by George Puttenham. Edited by Gladys Doidge Willcock and Alice Walker. Cambridge, 1936.

¹⁵Bk iii, ch. xxv.

¹⁶Pp. 303-06.

¹⁷Professor Lovejoy suggests that in *WT*, IV, iv, 89-90, Shakspere is making a "devastating comment upon the primitivism of Montaigne" (*Prim.*, p. 207). Whether this were Shakspere's design is as impossible to prove as the relation with Puttenham's remarks suggested above. Professor Lovejoy's conjecture is in keeping with Shakspere's jocose treatment of a theme from Montaigne's essay *Des Cannibales* (I, 31) in *Tempest*, II, i, 147 f. On the other hand, Shakspere would probably know Puttenham's treatise at least as well as Florio's Montaigne; and the tenor of Polixenes' remarks, with their horticultural application, is directly reminiscent of Puttenham. It is not impossible that Shakspere was recalling what he had read in both Puttenham and Montaigne.

SHAKSPERE'S HEROIC SHREW

BY RAYMOND A. HOUK

THIS study of *The Taming of the Shrew*, suggested by a recent physiological diagnosis of Katherine's shrewishness,¹ is largely a restatement of the traditional interpretation, supported by examples from contemporaneous literature.

It is almost axiomatic that improper diet disturbs bodily functions, and thus unfavorably affects a person's disposition, and that a person whose bodily functions are already deranged is more susceptible to harm from improper diet than is a normally healthy person. Such would seem to have been Isaac Reed's opinion when he quoted from *The Glass of Humours* the advice that "a choleric man" should "abstain from all salt, scorched, dry meats, from mustard, and such like things as will aggravate his malignant humours."²

Reed and his followers, Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke³ and W. J. Rolfe,⁴ seem to have accepted as true Petruchio's assertion that the meat in *The Shrew* was burnt and that Katherine was choleric:

I tell thee, Kate, 'twas burnt and dried away,
And I expressly am forbid to touch it;
For it engenders choleric, planteth anger,
And better 'twere that both of us did fast,
Since, of ourselves, ourselves are choleric,
Than feed it with such over-roasted flesh. (IV . i . 173-178)⁵

The notion, which would seem to derive from Galen,⁶ that burnt meat engenders choleric, is not here in controversy.

That the meat actually was burnt and that Katherine actually was choleric will, however, be challenged along with Mr. Draper's thesis that Katherine was the victim of choleric and that Petruchio's method of taming her was in accord with the approved treatment for choleric persons.

Although the words 'choler' and 'choleric' seem to have been used both in a physical and a non-physical sense from the time of Aristotle down to the present,⁷ they will be employed herein only in the physical sense in which they

were used in the sixteenth century in association with the doctrine of the four humors.

The word 'humor' obviously is used both in *The Shrew* (I. ii. 107; III. ii. 29; III. ii. 70; IV. i. 212) and in *The Taming of a Shrew* (I. i. 74; II. i. 129; III. i. 43)⁸ only in a non-physical sense. The term 'choleric humor' does not occur either in *The Shrew* or in *A Shrew*.⁹

That Shakspere employs the doctrine of the four humors neither to account for Katherine's shrewish conduct nor to explain her taming, and that he makes no use of the idea of choler (and the idea of melancholy) other than as rhetoric wherewith to impose upon a helpless woman (and to delude a simple tinker), will become apparent during the following discussion.

I

There is no reason to believe that Shakspere in *The Shrew* thinks of Katherine's shrewishness either as choler or as resulting from a choleric humor, nor, in fact, as any kind of a physical or mental disorder; his conception is rather that of the traditional shrew of literature.

1. To take as literally true all of the several descriptions of Katherine, whether made in jest or earnest, in sorrow or in anger, would be to fail to understand both the genius of the English language and the character of Shakspere's heroine.

(1) The theory of a choleric humor in *The Shrew*, made familiar to six decades of Shakspere students by Rolfe's notes on IV i. 155, 156; IV. iii. 25,¹⁰ is overthrown by a study of the wider sweep of the play.

Should, however, Rolfe's, or Reed's, literal interpretation be the true one, it would indicate no more than that, among Katherine's other frailties, a choleric disturbance is occasionally attributed to her. It would be no radical alteration of the traditional view to regard choler as a physical symptom contributing to Katherine's shrewish temper. This would, of course, be something else than equating her shrewishness with choler or regarding her shrewishness as the result of a choleric humor.

Rolfe and his authorities seem to have regarded

Petruchio's depriving Katherine of the allegedly burnt meat merely as a means to prevent an aggravation of her "malignant" humor,¹¹ and as "one of the best means of leading to its cure."¹² It seems to have been Mr. Draper's own idea to equate Katherine's alleged choler with her shrewishness, and the alleged cure for choler with the actual taming of the shrew.

In opposition to the literal interpretation recorded by Rolfe, and in refutation of Mr. Draper's extension of that interpretation, it is herein argued that Petruchio's brief disquisition on roast meat in *The Shrew*, IV . i . 161-179, is a device which he uses to show Katherine the folly of a habit of faultfinding (*cf.* lines 202-203), and also to gain time. Petruchio apparently wishes to bring her to the extremities of hunger (*cf.* line 193) without being involved in the meantime in an exchange of grievous words or in unprofitable debates. His stated policy is to pretend that he does all "in reverend care of her" (lines 206-207).

His depriving Katherine of meat in this scene is a continuation of his plan, begun earlier, to bring her to terms by means of hunger; but the present behavior of Katherine probably reinforces his determination to famish her. Before beginning to eat supper Petruchio asks her, "Will you give thanks, sweet Kate, or else shall I?" (line 162). Katherine does not seem to make any response to this request. Although later Petruchio explicitly makes the giving of thanks a condition which she must meet before she is to be allowed to eat (IV . iii . 41-44), he does not stop here to argue the point; he will wait until she has become more hungry, and more tractable.

Moreover, upon Katherine's silence after his request that she shall give thanks, Petruchio probably suspects that she is about to burst out in a typical storm of abuse (*cf.* I . i . 176-178; III . iii . 209-223; IV . iii . 73-80). Suggestive also of a coming storm are Petruchio's repeated injunctions: "Sit down, Kate, and welcome" (IV . i . 145), "Nay, good sweet Kate, be merry" (line 146), "Be merry, Kate" (line 152), "Come Kate, and wash, and welcome heartily" (line 157), "Come, Kate, sit down" (line 161), without accompanying indications of the manner or the extent of Katherine's com-

pliance. Anticipating a possible bursting of the floodgates, accordingly, he gives her an example of faultfinding which she will remember for days. He asks, "What's this? mutton?" (line 163); and promptly rejects it with the declaration, "'Tis burnt, and so is all the meat" (line 164).¹³ He thus makes scapegoats of the servants; they "grumble" (line 170), as if to protest that the meat was not really burnt. Katherine declares, "The meat was well" (line 172). Petruchio, whose humor it is that his servants and his wife shall accept as true whatever absurdity he may utter, merely repeats his assertion: "I tell thee, Kate, 'twas burnt and dried away" (line 173). Katherine, who has not yet learned to agree with Petruchio against the evidence of her senses, probably retains her belief that the meat was not burnt. Later, after declaring that she is "starv'd for meat," she says to Grumio:

And that which spites me more than all these wants—
He does it under name of perfect love;
As who should say, if I should sleep or eat,
'Twere deadly sickness or else present death. (IV. iii. 9, 11-14)

Katherine apparently thinks Petruchio's stated reasons for depriving her of food are mere pretense.

Petruchio admits as much—to the audience, though not to her:

As with the meat, some undeserv'd fault
I'll find about the making of the bed; (IV. i. 202-203)

His earlier words, accordingly, are not to be so interpreted as to mean that the meat was actually burnt.

Petruchio may have been well pleased with himself for hitting upon the idea of choler and burnt meat as a pretext for ushering Katherine into the bridal chamber without any supper (IV. i. 180-181).¹⁴ His pretense permitted him to maintain the rôle of one who is doing all under name of perfect love. On Thursday he assures her,¹⁵

Here, love; thou seest how diligent I am,
To dress thy meat myself and bring it thee.
I am sure, sweet, Kate, this kindness merits thanks. (IV. iii. 39-41)

The choleric idea was a good one, as his servant Grumio seems also to have thought. In *The Shrew*, IV. iii. 1-35, although Katherine is like to die from hunger after what would seem to have been a four days' fast,¹⁶ Grumio baits

her with the very name of meat and taunts her thrice with "I fear 'tis choleric" or "too hot a little."¹⁷ In this latter scene it does not seem to be a question of meat burnt or dried away; Grumio merely declares that he fears lest the imaginary "neat's foot" and "fat tripe finely broil'd" are choleric. Whether or not such dishes were supposed in the sixteenth century to be conducive to choleric,¹⁸ there can be little question but that "the mustard without the beef" would have been "too hot a little" (line 25). Thus Shakspere seems to have reduced the whole question of choleric meat to an absurdity; he does not again refer either to it or to the idea that Katherine may have been choleric.

Shakspere's use of the idea of choleric, accordingly, serves but a limited purpose in *The Shrew*; it in no way defines Katherine's shrewishness as a physical ailment.

The use of medical terms in the Induction of *The Shrew* would seem to reinforce this interpretation of Katherine's alleged choleric as a mere pretext. After he wakes in strange surroundings and amid protestations of homage which he cannot accept as genuine, Christopher Sly is told that he has but lately recovered from a fifteen-year period of lunacy (Ind. ii. 14-34, 79-82),¹⁹ and that he is now in the melancholy stage (lines 134-135).²⁰ Thus he is persuaded to believe that his actual memories are but the hallucinations of that alleged lunacy (Ind. i. 62-65); and, by the argument that he is melancholic and in danger of relapsing into lunacy, he is also persuaded to sit and hear a play (Ind. ii. 131-138), rather than to go to bed immediately with his pretended "wife" (lines 118-125).

That Sly has been lunatic, and is now actually melancholic, no critic of *The Shrew* could possibly maintain. Likewise, in the play proper, when Katherine is told that she is choleric and, consequently, should not eat burnt meat, she may not actually be choleric; she may have been told so only in order the more easily to secure her compliance.

(2) Inasmuch as Mr. Draper imputes to Katherine a sexual incontinency which he uses to buttress his theory of a choleric humor, several other passages in *The Shrew* should be given some attention.

In the case of the first, IV . i . 185, it may not be possible to determine whether there is any sexual implication in Curtis' answer to Grumio that Petruchio is in Katherine's chamber, "making a sermon of continency to her," much, as Mr. Draper would have it, to her embarrassment or "insult."²¹

Curtis' words, in the scene of IV . i . 182-214 (which probably occurs on Monday morning,²² after what would seem to have been a sleepless night for Katherine), need signify no more than a servant's joke about newly-weds; or, at the most, they may be a humorous interpretation of debates in the bridal chamber. When Petruchio presently enters he says not a word about sexual incontinency.

Petruchio's task in the taming of the shrew obviously was with Katherine's lack of self-restraint in general, not with warding off her nuptial caresses, which, on the contrary, because of spite, she may have refused to grant him. Moreover, the context in *The Shrew* provides, in Katherine's deprivation of all food, grounds for her to offer protests and reproaches, which may well have led Petruchio to hold forth on the theme of continency, whether in jest or in earnest. Not having eaten since Sunday morning (or Saturday evening),²³ she may have been clamorous for food by Monday. Instead of breakfast, Petruchio seems to have fed her with empty words. (cf. IV . iii . 10).

The word 'hot', used twice with reference to Katherine, does not necessarily have a choleric or a sexual significance; it is employed with other, and sometimes figurative, meanings in *The Shrew* (IV . i . 6, cf. IV . iii . 25).

Petruchio's statement in the betrothal scene, that Katherine "is not hot, temperate as the morn" (II . i . 296), which might doubtfully be paraphrased as "not intemperate, but temperate" or as "not hot, but lukewarm," hardly lends itself to the supposition that Katherine may have been suspected of having too much of Venus' quality or of being "overpassionate."²⁴

Curtis' question before the home-coming of Katherine, "Is she so hot a shrew as she's reported?" (IV . i . 22), might well be paraphrased as, "Is she so wrathful a shrew."²⁵ Any

other interpretation would be more of a commentary on Curtis' habits of thought than on Katherine's character.

Petruchio's reference to Katherine as "a lusty wench" (II. i. 161) has no sexual implication;²⁶ he is thinking of her violence in word and deed at the lute lesson (*cf.* lines 143-163). Nor does her "envy" of Bianca (lines 1-36), often used to support the notion that she was longing for a husband, amount to more than a desire to be married and thus to end an intolerable situation in which she has appeared too much at a disadvantage.

Neither should Katherine's shrewishness, which had long antedated her marriage, be attributed to any sexual disappointment, such as Sir David Lyndsay gives as the cause of the shrewish outbursts of the wives of the "Taylour" and the "Sowtar" in *Ane Satyre of the Three Estaitis*.²⁷

The following words of Hortensio may serve to prevent any interpretation of *The Shrew* which would becloud Katherine's reputation for sexual integrity:

Her only fault (and that is faults enough)
Is that she is intolerable curst,
And shrowd and froward so beyond all measure. (I. ii. 88-90)

This account would seem to comprise "all her faults" (line 187).

There is, accordingly, no evidence in *The Shrew* to support a theory of sexual abnormality as a physical condition provocative of Katherine's shrewish outbursts.

(3) The diabolical references in *The Shrew* indicate neither a physical choler nor a demoniacal possession.

Nowhere in *The Shrew* does Katherine use her alleged choler as an excuse to explain or to defend her conduct; nor do others in the play apologize for her shrewishness as a physical defect; her father does not enjoin his new son-in-law to use Katherine tenderly because she has excessive bile, as, for instance, the mother in *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin* advised the young man to be kind to her daughter, and as "Jone" herself requested,²⁸

But sometime ye must me a little forbeare,
For I am hasty, but it is soone done:

In my fume I doe nothing feare,
Whatsoever thereof to me become.

Katherine makes no similar confession; she seems, however, to be aware that she has been called, with some justice, a devil.

The father in *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin* declares that his daughter "is conditioned . . . like a Fiend," and refers to her as "a devillishe Fende of hell."²⁹ In even more embittered terms he declares of his wife, Jone's mother, "She will me charme: the Devill her kill."³⁰ Because the young wife has "played the devell" with them, the servants report to their master, "Our dame is the devell." Jone, however, tells her husband to "Ryde to the Devell, and to his dame."³¹

Hortensio and Gremio, accustomed to call Katherine "a devil" and "the devil's dam" (III . ii . 158), had precedent also in the Bible: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do" (John viii . 44), but apparently they did not share Petruchio's possible recollection of the Biblical saying that "A soft answer turneth away wrath: but grievous words stir up anger" (Proverbs xv . i).³² Hortensio, even while he is insulting Katherine to her face, seems, as has been frequently noticed, to imitate a response in the litany of the *Book of Common Prayer*, "From all such devils good Lord deliver us!" (I . i . 66). Gremio adds his petition (line 67), and presently speaks of "the penance of her tongue" (line 90). Whether 'curst' is used in *The Shrew* (I . i . 185; I . ii . 99, 128, 129, 184; II . i . 187, 294, 308, 315; V . ii . 188) with any scriptural or ecclesiastical connotation is not apparent.

After a scene in which Katherine would seem to have had just cause for anger and tears (III . ii . 1-25), Baptista throws clearer light on the nature of her disposition,

Go, girl. I cannot blame thee now to weep;
For such an injury would vex a saint,
Much more a shrew of thy impatient humour. (lines 27-29)

In contrasting a shrew of her impatient humor with a saint, Baptista seems to be using Biblical language.³³

Later the tamed Katherine, in apparently equating her

former self with all "headstrong women" refusing obedience to their husbands, rises to a greater height of eloquence with the figure:

What is she but a foul contending rebel
And graceless traitor to her loving lord? (V. ii. 159-160).

Such language seems reminiscent of the angels who contended with the Almighty and fell from heaven (*cf.* Luke x. 18; 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6 and 9).

Richard Hooker has the phrase, "foul and wicked spirit." Writing in Book I of *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* on the fallen angels, he speaks of their former virtue, their pride, their breach of duty, and their continuing "rebellion" in their dispersion in the air, on the earth, in the water, and under the earth.³⁴ Forgetting "their subordination unto God and their dependency on him" and admiring too much "their own sublimity and honour," they had interrupted "their adoration, love, and imitation of God." The sin of these "wicked spirits," laboring to effect the "utter destruction of the works of God," was rooted in their own "conceit." It would not have been in consequence of excessive bile.

Marlowe in *Doctor Faustus* has much to say of the fallen angels:³⁵

Fa. Was not that *Lucifer* an Angell once?
Me. Yes, *Faustus*, and most dearely lov'd of God.
Fa. How comes it then that he is prince of divels?
Me. O, by aspiring pride and insolence,
For which God threw him from the face of heaven.
Fa. And what are you that live with *Lucifer*?
Me. Unhappy spirits that fell with *Lucifer*,
Conspir'd against our God with *Lucifer*,
And are for ever damnd with *Lucifer*. (lines 300-308)

After an exhibition of what he names her "insolence" (II. i. 23), Baptista calls Katherine a "hilding of a devilish spirit" (line 26). Hortensio, carrying the marks of Katherine's violence from the lute lesson, speaks of her "most impatient devilish spirit" (line 152). Elsewhere she is called "proud-minded" (line 132).

Gremio, moreover, after having called Katherine a "fiend of hell" (I. i. 88), argues, in language recalling another

passage from *Doctor Faustus*, that she should be provided with a devil, not a husband:

Gre. What's that, I pray?

Hor. Marry, sir, to get a husband for her sister.

Gre. A husband? a devil!

Hor. I say a husband.

Gre. I say a devil. Think'st thou, Hortensio, though her father be very rich, any man is so very a fool to be married to hell? (I. i. 122-129)

Faustus rejects "a wife" brought him from hell:³⁶

Me. How, a wife? I prithee *Faustus* talke not of a wife.

Fau. Nay sweete *Mephistophilis* fetch me one, for I will have one

Me. Well thou wilt have one, sit there till I come, Ile fetch thee a wife in the divels name. (Exit.)

Enter [Mephistophilis] with a divell drest like a woman, with fier workes.

Me. Tel [me] *Faustus*, how dost thou like thy wife?

Fau. A plague on her for a hote whore. (lines 575-581)³⁷

Both Gremio and Hortensio in *The Shrew* had declined Baptista's invitation to "court" Katherine. Gremio preferred

To cart her rather. She's too rough for me.

There, there, Hortensio, will you any wife? (I. i. 54-56)

Hortensio, presently threatened by the irate Katherine, prayed, "From all such devils good Lord deliver us!" (lines 63-66).

Shakspere, accordingly, seems to have used his diabolical terms after familiar patterns, but neither his language nor the associations thereby evoked properly afford any support to anyone who would argue that Katherine was suffering from a physical excess of choler or bile—a condition which could hardly have been literally attributed even by the medical men of the sixteenth century to the devils of hell.

Despite these epithets applied to Katherine, Shakspere does not intend her to be regarded literally as a devil, or as one possessed of a devil.³⁸ Although the lines quoted above,

What is she but a foul contending rebel

And graceless traitor to her loving lord?

would, if taken literally, equate Katherine with the fallen angels, such could hardly have been Shakspere's intention. To make her a devil would be to make Petruchio a god. The language of her speech is extravagant enough, but she

approaches no nearer divinity than the use of such phrases as "thy lord, thy king, thy governor," and "thy lord, thy life, thy keeper, Thy head, thy sovereign," and "Such duty as the subject owes the prince" (V. ii. 138, 146-147, 155). These terms and the context in general leave Petruchio and other "lords and husbands" as but men, and Katherine but a woman.

Katherine, moreover, is described in more moderate terms elsewhere in the play. When Gremio reports to Tranio that Petruchio, judged by his conduct at the wedding, is "a devil, a devil, a very fiend," and Tranio urges in opposition that Katherine is "a devil, a devil, the devil's dam," Gremio asserts, "Tut, she's a lamb, a dove, a fool to him!" (III. ii. 157-159). Katherine, however, is hardly a lamb, a dove (*cf.* II. i. 208), and a fool; nor, as is elsewhere intimated, is she at once a stale (I. i. 58), a rotten apple (I. i. 139), a wildcat (I. ii. 197; *cf.* II. i. 279), a soldier (II. i. 146), a wasp (II. i. 210), a falcon, haggard, or kite (IV. i. 193, 196, 198), a puppet (IV. iii. 103), and a deer (V. ii. 56).

Jesting remarks about choler and, possibly, about sexual propensities, and the use of diabolical terms to express a personal dislike of shrewishness, do not provide the key to a true understanding of Katherine's character.

(*To be concluded*)

¹John W. Draper, "Kate the Curst," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, LXXXIX (1939), 757-764.

²*The Plays of William Shakespeare* (London, 1803), IX, 147. Reed cites "The Glass of Humors, no date, p. 60."

³*The Plays of William Shakespeare*, edited and annotated by Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke (Cassell, Petter & Galpin, London, n.d., 3 vols.), usually referred to as *Cassell's Illustrated Shakespeare*.

⁴*The Taming of the Shrew*, W. J. Rolfe (New York, 1881).

⁵*The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, G. L. Kittredge (Boston, 1936).

⁶*Galen On the Natural Faculties*, tr. A. J. Brock (London, 1916), pp. 191, 211.

⁷For Aristotle's distinction "between three types of choler," see Draper, *op. cit.*, p. 759.

⁸*The Taming of a Shrew*, F. S. Boas (London, 1918).

⁹See "The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*," *PMLA*, LVII (1942), 1009-1038, for a comparative study of *The Shrew* and *A Shrew*, and a suggested reconstruction of the original form of the play. Although it must be recognized that *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* had a common source, yet the fact that *The Shrew* is a rewriting of an earlier form of the play largely similar in content to *A Shrew* makes it practicable, with some reservation, to use *A Shrew* as if it were the actual source of *The Shrew*.

¹⁰Rolfe, pp. 157, 160.

¹¹Reed, p. 147.

¹²Clarke, I, 508.

¹³Ariosto had referred to the danger of over-roasting or burning mutton (*Gascoyne's Supposes*, V, iv, 9-20).

¹⁴Ferando in *A Shrew*, III, i, 30, gives a similar excuse for depriving Kate of supper, i.e., that the meat is "burnt and scorched." Ferando says nothing of choler, but, on the following Thursday, his jesting servant Sander tells Kate that "the mustard is too choleric for her" (III, iii, 13).

¹⁵For the chronology of the play, see "The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*," *op. cit.*, pp. 1021-1023, 1024-1028.

¹⁶Gascoyne has the expression, "like to die for hunger" (*Supposes*, II, iv, 137).

¹⁷Shakspere makes a similar "jest" about "dry" meat in *The Comedy of Errors*, II, ii, 60-64.

¹⁸Clarke would seem to deny that "tasteless neat's foot and insipid tripe are 'choleric'" (*op. cit.*, p. 513.)

¹⁹In *A Shrew*, Ind, ii, 40, Sly is also said to have been subject to "frantic fits."

²⁰Mr. Draper errs in crediting Sly with a "supposed fifteen years of 'melancholy'" (*op. cit.*, p. 762)—rather than fifteen years of lunacy.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 761.

²²See "The Evolution of *The Taming of the Shrew*," *op. cit.*, pp. 1022-1023.

²³Katherine may have fasted on Sunday morning before going to church to be married.

²⁴Draper, *op. cit.*, p. 761.

²⁵In *A Shrew*, III, i, 5, Tom remarks to Sander, "they say she's a plaguey shrew." See note 37 below.

²⁶Cf. Draper, *op. cit.*, pp. 757-759.

²⁷Edinburgh, 1602 (written ca. 1552). See *The Works of Sir David Lindsay*, Douglas Hamer (Edinburgh, 1931), Vol. II, pp. 139-149, lines 1280-1387. There is a certain resemblance between the relationship of the reformed Katherine to the "froward" wives of Hortensio and Lucentio in the last scene of *The Shrew* and the relationship of personified Chastitie to the shrewish wives of the Taylour and the Sowtar in Lyndsay's play. Other parallels suggest the theory that *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaits* may have been used in the making of *The Shrew*.

²⁸Quoted from the text published in *The Old Taming of a Shrew* (London, 1844), pp. 60, 62. Cf. *The Shrew*, II, i, 153.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 57, 58.

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 58. In *The Shrew* occur the expressions "charm him first to keep his tongue" (I, i, 214) and "charm her chattering tongue" (IV, ii, 58).

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 74, 75, 78. Similar language appears in *A Shrew* "as . . . to the devil himself" (I, i, 51); "this devilish scold" (I, i, 68), "The devil himself dares scarce venture to woo her" (I, i, 115), "The devil shall teach her first" (II, i, 37); "Thy mistress is such a devil" (II, ii, 22).

³²Quoted from a late edition of the King James version of 1611.

³³The folio reads "a very saint."

³⁴London, 1593 (?). Cf. *Hooker's Works* (Oxford, 1888), I, 214-215 (I, iv, 3). This parallelism between disobedient wives and fallen angels suggests an indebtedness to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*. Others, e.g. C. M. Gayley (*Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America*, New York, 1917), have argued for Shakespeare's use of Hooker. Cf. Hardin Craig, *The Enchanted Glass* (New York, 1936), p. 26.

³⁵*The Works of Christopher Marlowe*, C. F. Tucker Brooke (Oxford, 1910, 1929), p. 155.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 164 (text of 1604). Variations in the text of 1616 include: "He fetches in a woman devill" and "Here's a hot whore indeed, no, I'le no wife."

³⁷Faustus' "A plague on her for a hote whore," together with the mention of "fier workes" in the 1604 text of Marlowe's play, may have found an echo in Curtis' "Is she so hot a shrew as she's reported." See text served by note 25 above.

³⁸The Lord in the Induction (ii, 17) pretends to lament that Sly is "infused with so foul a spirit." Had Shakspere chosen to regard his heroine as actually possessed of a devil, he might, in taming her, have used the Biblical formula, "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting" (Matt. xvii, 21).

MOVING A SCAR FROM *ALL'S WELL*

By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM

7 The first few mortal wages
in fixing a piano

Just as the maid called Diana seems to yield to Bertram's unholy suit, she says, according to the First Folio:

I see that men make rope's in such a scarre,
That wee'l forsake our selues. (IV. ii. 38-39)

It is not doubted by any reader of the play that Diana means to say that women may be dissuaded from a course of virtue by the ardent solicitations of a male wooer; but why the rope (or ropes) and a scar? The editors and commentators of Shakspere, too, have been puzzled, and they have turned to the other Folios—in vain—for assistance, even though one of these omits the apostrophe in 'rope's'. A few, very few, critics have retained or defended the original text and have attempted to interpret the passage as it stands, only changing 'scarre' to 'scar.' Some editors retain even the 'scarre' as a hint to the reader that there is some obscurity in the passage. The vast majority of scholars admit that emendation is necessary but do not think that scholarship will ever succeed in recovering and establishing Shakspere's intention. Notwithstanding this scepticism, we think that the passage is not hopeless.

The various attempts to alter or emend Diana's words so that they will make sense fitting the situation may be listed as follows, with some hints as to the interpretations:

N. Rowe (1709): Make hopes in such affairs
 E. Malone (1780): Make hopes in such a scene
 A. Becket (1815): Make mopes in such a scar
 Make japes of such a scathe
 Z. Jackson (1819): Make ropes on such a scarr
 C. Knight (c 1843): Make hopes in such a scarre [= cliff]
 J. P. Collier (c 1850): Make slopes in such a scarre
 Make ropes in such a staire
 (1853): Make hopes in such a suit

A. Dyce (1853): Make hopes in such a case
 S. W. Singer (1853): Make hopes in such a scare [=cause of alarm]
 Make hopes in such a war
 H. Staunton (c 1858?): Make hopes in such a snare
 W. N. Lettson (1860): Make ropes in such a scape
 Bubier: Make ropes in such a snare
 J. Addis (1866): May drop's in such a scarre [= precipice]
 S. Bailey (1866): Place hopes in such a swearing.
 T. Keightley (1867): Make ropes of oaths and vows to scale our fort
 in hope
 R. M. Spence (1877): Make promise—such as care
 J. Bulloch (1878): May crop's in such a scar
 J. G. Herr (1879): Make oaths, in such a siege
 Make loves in such a service
 F. G. Fleay: Make rapes in such a scare
 B. G. Kinnear (1883): Have hopes, in such a cause,
 P. Perring (1885): Make ropes in such a stair
 K. Deighton (c 1888?): May rope's in such a snarle
 J. G. B. (1884): Make vowes in such a scape [= transgression]
 P. A. Daniel (1889): May rope's, in such a scare
 W. W. Lloyd (1889): May hope, on such a score
 (1891): Make hopes for such a lure
 T. Tyler (1889): Make ropes in such a scaine [= skein of protestations]
 J. G. Orger (1890): Lay traps, and set such snares
 G. Joicey (1892): Make hopes of such a price
 Make hopes in such a parle
 A. E. Thiselton (1900): May rape's in such a scare
 Make rapels [lures] in such a scare
 W. E. Henley (c 1904?): Make hopes in such a scare [= cliff]
 H. Cunningham (1914): Make cope's in such a case
 May broke's in such a cause
 W. H. Pinchbeck (1914): Make rousps [outcries] in such a scare
 J. D. Wilson (1929): Make rapes in such a scour [sudden onset]
 C. F. T. Brooke (1943): May grope's [beguile us] in such a scarre
 [= a partly submerged rock]

In all probability, the above list does not catalogue all past attempts to emend a passage which has been labeled a 'hopeless crux' but it certainly includes all that are worthy of even the slightest claim to serious consideration. With the exception of substituting 'hopes' for 'rope's,' very few of these have been adopted in editions of the play. The original text, notwithstanding its acknowledged obscurity, has been retained and interpreted by several editors and commentators. All who have done so have resorted to such fantastical tricks and have discovered such far-fetched metaphors in the

words that common-sense readers and scholars will have nothing to do with them.

Those who know the play and are acquainted with printing house practices and the peculiarities of Elizabethan secretary script will, I am reasonably certain, approve of the emendation which I am publishing herewith. We must remember that the amorous Bertram is pleading for the privilege of copulation with a virgin who has promised his rejected wife an opportunity to spend a night with him in her stead, herself most chastely absent. Diana must pretend to yield to his unholy wooing, but she must do this with great reluctance and only after vehement suit, so that she may be in a better position to demand the precious ring of him. Having brought him to a pitch of excitement which knows no bounds, she pretends not only that he has overcome her holy scruples but that her own passions have been stirred to the yielding point. She expresses this in the words, 'I see that men may cope's in such a stir that we'll foresake ourselves'. She accompanies these words, we may rest assured, with 'business' importing surrender; she lets him kiss her or embrace her. Then, pretending to notice his ring, she coquettishly asks him to give it to her. His first reaction is refusal; thereupon she pretends to withdraw her consent and, of course, succeeds in her trick.

'Scarre' is a misreading of Shakspere's 'sturre'. All who are acquainted with the secretary script know that *c* for *t* and *t* for *c* are the most easy and among the most common blunders in the reading of Elizabethan manuscripts. This is equally true of the confusion between *u* and *a*. That is why we have 'scale't' for 'stale't' (*Coriolanus*, I, i, 97), 'cesterned' for 'testern'd' (*Two Gentlemen*, I, i, 155), 'Ace' for 'Ate' (*King John*, II, i, 63), 'Place' for 'Plate' (*King Lear*, IV, vi, 169), 'scorn' for 'storm' (*Troilus and Cressida*, I, i, 37), 'stallion' for 'scullion' (*Hamlet*, II, ii, 615), 'raine' for 'ruine' (*Hamlet*, III, iii, 22), etc. That Shakspere sometimes wrote 'sturre' for 'stir' is sufficiently proved by the occurrence of the former spelling in the 1604 Quarto of *Hamlet* (in I, i, 161 and in I, v, 34). *The Oxford Dictionary* shows that 'sturre' was current throughout the 16th century.

An error in the reading of Elizabethan manuscripts which occurs occasionally is the mistaking of a *c* for an *r* (see the lower case *c*'s depicted on page 34 of my book, *The Hand-writing of the Renaissance*). That Shakspere's manuscripts contained *c*'s resembling *r*'s is shown by such errors as 'back' for 'bark' (*Comedy of Errors*, I, i, 116), 'abdication' for 'alteration' (*King Lear*, V, i, 3), 'ran' for 'can' (*Hamlet*, IV, vii, 85 in the Folio), 'court' for 'coact' (*Troilus and Cressida*, V, ii, 118—note also the *u* for *a*), 'art' for 'act' (*Othello*, III, iii, 328, in the first Quarto), 'peere' for 'piece' (*Henry VIII*, V, ii, 8), 'inraged' for 'incaged' (*Richard II*, II, i, 102).

The mistake of 'may' for 'make' may be explained on the theory that Shakspere wrote 'maie' in such a way that *ie* looked like a poorly made *k*. From Shakspere's signatures we may infer that he sometimes made his *k*'s very imperfectly. It is also possible that the compositor, puzzled by the words 'maie cope's,' set up 'make rope's', thinking that that made sense. Or he may accidentally, as a result of a 'foul case,' have picked up a *k* instead of an *i*. Rowe, unable to make sense of 'make rope's' changed it to 'make hopes', even though that is contrary to English idiom and does not fit the psychological requirements of the passage.

The wily Diana's use of the word 'cope' requires explanation. Shakspere used the word in various senses, with and without the preposition 'with' (see the *Oxford Dictionary* or John Foster's *A Shakespeare Word-Book*). Here Diana uses it in the sense of to 'assail'; what she says is, 'I see that men may assail us [women], when we are in such a state of emotional disturbance (as I am now), so forcefully (or so cunningly), that we abandon our principles and yield to their solicitations.' An alternative interpretation of Diana's words might be this: 'I see that a man may drive a woman into such a state of sexual excitement that she has to submit to him.' The word 'cope' has been subtly chosen by Diana Shakspere to imply yielding after a struggle.

SORROW AND LOVE ON THE ELIZABETHAN STAGE

By LAWRENCE BABB

ALFRED HARBAGE has convincingly argued the case for "formal" as opposed to "natural" acting on the Elizabethan stage.¹ There remains the task of determining how the specific emotions were conventionally represented. Although the evidence is meager, the task seems worth attempting. In this paper I shall point out some stage conventions associated with grief and love. What I have to say pertains to the appearance and deportment of the actor rather than to his delivery.

I.

In *A Looking Glass for London and England*, the King of Paphlagonia, who has suffered a great calamity and a great wrong, enters "*Male-content*."² Since this word occurs in a stage direction, it is evidently intended to specify the appearance and demeanor of the actor. A review of the superficial traits of the melancholy malcontent,³ a familiar social type in Elizabethan London, will make the dramatist's intention clearer.

The melancholy malcontent is a man who has been disheartened and embittered by the world's failure to appreciate and reward the abilities which he believes he has. Elizabethan and early Stuart satires depict his dress and manner rather clearly. Sir John Harington's Ajax becomes "a perfect malcontent; *viz.*, his hat without a band, his hose without garters, his waist without a girdle, his boots without spurs . . ."⁴ John Earle's "discontented Man" affects "a studied carelesnesse with his armes a crosse, and a neglected hanging of his head and cloake, and he is as great an enemie to an hatband as Fortune."⁵ The malcontent hero of Samuel Rowlands' *The Melancholie Knight* soliloquizes:

I crosse mine armes at crosses that arise,
And scoffe blinde Fortune, with hat ore mine eyes.⁶

On the title page appears a picture of the knight standing

gloomily with arms crossed and hat pulled low. The malcontent's facial expression is morosely stolid; he sits "blockish, neuer laughing, neuer speaking, but so Bearishlie, as if he would deuour all the companie."⁷

The melancholy malcontent, then, is distinguished by the neglected disorder of his clothing (especially by the lack of garters and hatband), by his folded arms and hat pulled low, by a morose and stony expression. Like most melancholy men, of course, he is deeply despondent. In *A Looking Glass* the dramatists evidently utilize the superficial traits of the London playgoer as a ready means of indicating profound depression. When Paphlagonia enters "Malecontent,"⁸ he suggests his distress of spirit by such details of appearance and manner as those mentioned.

There are other indications in the drama that the attributes of the malcontent are used as symbols of woe. The hero of Greene's *Alphonsus, King of Aragon*, after hearing the unhappy story of his family, hangs his "head as malcontent."⁹ Titus Andronicus asks his brother Marcus to

unknit that sorrow-wreathen knot:

Thy niece and I, poor creatures, want our hands,
And cannot passionate our ten-fold grief
With folded arms.¹⁰

In *Lust's Dominion* Eleazar the Moor stands "with crost arms . . . malecontent."¹¹ According to a stage direction, the "Tyrant" of *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, just after the suicide of the woman whom he loves, enters "wondrous discont[ent]edly."¹²

The adjective *melancholy* sometimes occurs in a stage direction at the entrance of a grief-stricken character. It can hardly be meant to refer to anything besides the actor's appearance and deportment, and its implications are probably similar to those of *malcontent*. There are two instances in Lodge's *The Wounds of Civil War*. Marius, after the city of Minturnum has refused him sanctuary, enters "very melancholie."¹³ Young Marius, his son, making the last defense of a lost cause, walks upon the walls of

Præneste "all in blacke and wonderfull mellancoly."¹⁴ In Webster's *The Devil's Law-Case*, Romelio, in the midst of calamity, enters "very melancholly."¹⁵ A clown in Webster's *Appius and Virginia* enters "melancholy."¹⁶

The folded arms and melancholy hat probably appeared frequently on the Elizabethan stage, much more frequently than the slender evidence can indicate. In the second scene of *Hamlet*, for example, the actor in the title rôle may have advertised his state of mind, not only by his "inky cloak," but by crossed arms, hat pulled down and eyes morosely fixed.

II.

Elizabethan and early Stuart Englishmen regard the lover, like the malcontent, as a melancholic type. For until love is consummated, its chief concomitant is sorrow, and sorrow engenders melancholy. Grieving lovers are sometimes called malcontents,¹⁷ and *discontent* and *discontented* are often used to denote their state of mind.¹⁸ Indeed, the superficial attributes of the lover are those of the malcontent.

It is "the humour" of all lovers, says Burton, "to be careless of their persons . . . their beards flag."¹⁹ The Overbury characters include "An Amorist," who illustrates the conventional appearance of the lover: "His armes are carelessly used, as if their best use was nothing but embracements. He is untrust, unbutton'd and ungartered."²⁰ In a passage dealing with amorous intrigue, John Davies of Hereford says that he has often seen "A well-made *Male*, as male-content to stand."²¹ Sir William Cornwallis scoffs at the lover's "crossed arms, and the Hat pulled down."²² On the title page of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* is a picture of an "*Inamorato*," who, like Rowlands' Melancholy Knight, stands with arms crossed and hat over eyes.

These features of dress and behavior are put to dramatic use. At the opening of Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar*

Bungay, Prince Edward enters "malcontented" and stands apart from his companions in "a melancholie dumpe," "all amort . . . malecontent."²³ One soon learns that his trouble is love. In Chapman's *An Humorous Day's Mirth*, the gull Labesha, because of disappointment in love, grows "marvellous malcontent . . . see where he comes."²⁴ In Marston's *What You Will*, Jacomo, in love, enters "unbraced and careles drest."²⁵ A gentleman in Field's *Amends for Ladies* complains that his sweetheart will not take his love seriously

'cause I do not weep,
Lay mine arms o'er my heart, and wear no garters,
Walk with mine eyes in my hat, sigh and make faces.²⁶

Field's audience, like this lady, would expect a character in love to exhibit some of these symptoms.

The adjective *melancholy* sometimes occurs in stage directions at the entry of a lover. Orleans, in Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, enters "melancholike" for love of Agripyne.²⁷ Wendoll, in Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, likewise enters "melancholy"²⁸ and soliloquizes on his love for his benefactor's wife. Since there is no other hint of melancholia about Wendoll, his melancholic entry is apparently merely a conventional indication of the deep distress which he is suffering. Sir Abraham Ninny, a comic character in Field's *A Woman Is a Weathercock*, falls in love and enters "melancholy,"²⁹ Webster's Appius, in love with Virginia, enters "melancholly."³⁰

There is evidence that Elizabethan actors employed conventional devices to represent falling in love, which is frequently a very precipitant occurrence in the old drama.

In Elizabethan novels a young man who sees the lady of his fate for the first time is commonly smitten dumb and for some moments gazes at her wide-eyed (and wide-mouthed?) in statuesque stupor. For example, when Arsadachus of Lodge's *A Margarite of America* saw the lovely Diana, "he grew so sodainely altered, that as such as beheld the head of *Medus* were altred from their shapes, so he that

saw the heauen of these beauties, was rauished from his sences."³¹ Lovers of the stage are apparently affected similarly.

In *Love's Labor's Lost* the King of Navarre falls in love at first sight with the Princess of France: "all his senses [are] lock'd in his eye"; his face is covered with "amazes . . . his eyes enchanted with gazes."³² In *As You Like It* Orlando, overcome by the charms of Rosalind, stands in her presence like "a quintain, a mere lifeless block,"³³ and is unable to utter a word. In *The Mad Lover Memnon*, an elderly general, falls in love at first sight with Calis. He stands gazing fixedly at her ("how he looks"), then "kneels amaz'd, and forgets to speak."³⁴ Later Siphax, another warrior, sees the same lady for the first time. He exclaims, "Keep me ye blest Angels, / What killing power is this?" and immediately becomes stupidly tongue-tied. "Sure these Souldiers," says Calis, "Are all grown senseless . . . Are all grown senseless . . . Are all dumb Saints."³⁵

In Marston's *The Insatiate Countess* there appears this stage direction: "Isabella falls in love . . ."³⁶ The foregoing should suggest what the dramatist meant to convey to the actor.

*Michigan State College
East Lansing, Michigan.*

¹"Elizabethan Acting," *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 685-708.

²*The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, ed. Collins (Oxford, 1905), I, 169.

³See especially E. E. Stoll, "Shakespere, Marston, and the Malcontent Type," *MP*, III (1906), 280-303; Zera S. Fink, "Jaques and the Malcontent Traveler," *PQ*, XIV (1935), 237-52.

In Elizabethan English *malcontent* does not always refer to this social type (see *NED*). A dramatist, however, would hardly use the word in any other sense in a stage direction, for in no other sense would it tell the actor anything definite about how he was to look or behave. Both of the co-authors of *A Looking Glass* use the word in independent works. In *The Repentance of Robert Greene*, it clearly refers to the character under consideration: "I ruffled out my silks, in the habit of *Malcontent*, and seemed [very] discontented . . ." (ed. Harrison [London, 1923], p. 20). In Lodge's *Wits Misery* the term probably but not certainly refers to the melancholic type (*Works*, Hunterian edition [1883], vol. IV; pp. 23, 73).

⁴*The Metamorphosis of Ajax*, ed. Whittingham (Chiswick, 1814), pp. 1-2.

⁵*Micro-Cosmographie*, ed. Arber (Westminster, 1895), p. 27.

⁶P. 7 (in *Works*, Hunterian edition [Glasgow, 1880], vol. II).

⁷R. R., *Questions, Concerning Conie-hood, and the Nature of the Conie* (London, 1595), sig. B3r.

⁸Paphlagonia is clearly not a malcontent in the sense of being a person who broods over his neglected excellences. It is a fair assumption, however, that he is a melancholy man. According to Renaissance medical theory, a great sorrow is very likely to engender melancholy (see especially Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. Shilleto [London, 1926-27], I, 298-300, 313-14). Paphlagonia is angry as well as sorrowful, and anger likewise causes melancholy (*ibid.*, I, 311-12).

⁹Plays, I, 82: Cf. *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, *Shakespeare's Library*, ed. Hazlitt (London, 1875), V, 260.

¹⁰III, ii, 4-7. I am using W. J. Craig's Oxford Shakespeare. Cf. *The Rape of Lucrece*, lines 793, 1662; Spenser, *The Visions of Bellay*, X, 2.

¹¹Ed. Brereton (Louvain, 1931), p. 19. Eleazar, like Paphlagonia, feels sullen resentment as well as sorrow.

¹²P. 52 (Malone Society Reprint). *Discontented* is often used in connection with the malcontent. John Earle, for example, calls his malcontent "A discontented Man" (see above). See also the quotation from Greene in footnote 3.

¹³P. 20 (in *Works*, vol. III).

¹⁴P. 62. The fact that he is in armor precludes some of the characteristic details.

¹⁵Works, ed. Lucas (London, 1927), II, 312.

¹⁶Ibid., III, 197.

¹⁷See *Love's Labor's Lost*, III, i, 193; Dekker, *A Knight's Conjuring*, ed. Rimbault (London, 1842), p. 73.

¹⁸See, for instance, Lodge's *Rosalind* (*Works*, vol. I), pp. 69, 104, 119, 120, 129, 130.

¹⁹*Anatomy*, III, 174.

²⁰Overbury, *Works*, ed. Rimbault (London, 1856), p. 58.

²¹*Microcosmos* (*Works*, ed. Grosart [Edinburgh, 1878], vol. I), p. 66.

²²*Essajes* (London, 1632), "Of Loue," no. 5.

²³Plays, II, 17.

²⁴Comedies, ed. Parrott (London, 1914), p. 85. Labesha swears that he will live forlornly "in silen[ce] . . . Mad, and melancholy . . . And never more wear hatband on my hat" (pp. 82-83).

²⁵Plays, ed. Wood Edinburgh, 1934-39), II, 237.

²⁶Old English Plays, ed. Dodsley-Hazlitt (London, 1874-76), XI, 96. There are many other references in the drama to the lover's disordered dress and dejected attitudes. See, for example, *Love's Labo's Lost*, III, i, 18-21, 191; IV, iii, 135; *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II, i, 20-21, 81, 84-86; *As You Like It*, III, ii, 400-06; *Hamlet*, II, i, 77-102. Folded arms are mentioned especially often. The "cross arms" are, in fact, "the lover's sign" (Middleton, *The Spanish Gipsy*, *Works*, ed. Bullen [London, 1885-86], VI, 186).

²⁷Works (London, 1873), I, 126.

²⁸Works (London, 1874), II, 108.

²⁹Old English Plays, ed. Dodsley-Hazlitt, XI, 34.

³⁰Works, III, 160.

³¹P. 64 (in *Works*, vol. III). Cf. Lodge, *Rosalind*, p. 23 (*Works*, vol. I); Greene, *Menaphon*, ed. Harrison (Oxford, 1927), pp. 33-34; Sidney, *Arcadia*, *Works*, ed. Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1922-26), I, 90.

³²II, i, 240-45.

³³I, ii, 268. Phebe seems to be struck speechless upon seeing "Ganymede" for the first time (III, v, 5-63).

³⁴The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, ed. Glover-Waller (Cambridge, 1905-12), III, 4-5. Cf. Heywood, *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, *Works*, II, 116.

³⁵Pp. 29-30.

³⁶Plays, III, 22.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

S. A. T.

JOHN DONNE & BIBLIOGRAPHY

F. W. Faxon Company of Boston have rendered a useful service to Elizabethan scholarship in publishing in pamphlet form Mr. William White's *John Donne since 1900: A Bibliography of Periodical Articles* which originally appeared in several issues of the *Bulletin of Bibliography* (September-December, 1937). The booklet consists of 16 leaves, of which the versos are blank, lists 'more than 500 items,' is provided with a one-page preface in which Mr. White points out a growing interest in Donne's neurotic work and personality, and sells for 75 cents.

Mr. White has done a fairly thorough job in compiling a list of Donne material accumulating in the hundreds of magazines devoted to literature and literary criticism and has given accurate references. Those who have engaged in this kind of compilation know that no bibliography of such a subject can ever be complete, even if one had dozens of assistants working in the libraries of all civilized countries, beastly Germany included. As far as we have been able to check, Mr. White has omitted from his list the following essays of any importance: Miss A. M. Perkins's dissertation, 'The pictorial in D's sermons' (abstracted in the *University of Arizona Bulletin*, Feb. 1941), Miss M. L. Wiley's 'Scepticism in the writings of J. D. and others' (a 1940 dissertation at Radcliffe College), Miss H. W. Siebenthal's dissertation (University of Oregon, 1935) on 'Seventeenth-century letters,' Mr. R. S. Forsythe's essay (in *PMLA*, Sept. 1925) on 'The passionate shepherd and English poetry,' E. B. Maras's thesis on 'The medieval element in J. D.'

(abstracted in the *University of Arizona Record*, Feb. 1939), F. O. Henderson's essay (in *ELH*, Dec. 1937), 'Traditions of *precieux* and *libertin*,' G. Williamson's 'Senecan style in the 17th century' (*PQ*, Oct. 1936), Miss Bennett's 'An aspect of the evolution of the 17th century prose' (in *RES*, July 1941), C. Whitby's 'The genius of J. D.' (*Poetry Review*, March 1923), E. Legouis's essay on J. D. in *Kevue des C & C* (April and May 1911), C. R. Brown's 'J. D. and Shakespeare' (in *NQ*, Dec. 11, 1926), D. Flower's 'Dr. Keynes on J. D.' (*Book Collector's Quarterly*, July 1931), A. M. Wasilifsky's thesis, 'J. D., the rhetor: a study of the tropes . . . in the St. Paul sermons, (*Abstract of Theses*, Cornell, 1935), H. C. Beeching's essay, 'Walton's life of J. D.' (*Cornhill Magazine*, 1900, 8:249-68), J. W. Chadwick's 'J. D., poet and preacher' (*New World*, 1900, 9:31-48), L. I. Guiney's 'D. as a lost Catholic poet' (*The Month*, 1920, 136:13-19). There are other omissions but we cannot list them here.

A serious defect in this bibliography (and in many others that we know of) is the omission of a name and subject index; without such an index a bibliography is of little or no value to a scholar engaged in research. The omission of such an index is a sign of either laziness or poor economy.

We have noted several errors of proofreading. On page 3 we have 'Mars,ton' for 'Marston,' on page 5 'Literature' for 'Literatur,' on page 9 'Uber' for 'Ueber' and 'Wein' for 'Wien,' and on page 19 'by' for 'be.'

A matter to which we wish scholars to give consideration is the custom—the illogical and bad custom—of print-

ing the volume number in roman letters (e.g. XLVIII) instead of in arabic (48) and of inserting the date between this and the page reference, thus: 'Sewanee Review, XLVIII (October-December, 1940), 552-555.' This is an illogical breaking up of the place reference by a time reference (as is proved by the parenthesis) and is ugly from a typographic viewpoint. Then there is the further consideration that most persons find it difficult to decipher the roman numerals. The rotten privilege of custom is all that can be urged in its defence, but as Shakspere said:

What custom wills, in all things
should we do't,
The dust on antique time would lie
unswept,
And monstrous error be too highly
heap'd
For truth t'o'erpeer.

THE SONNETS ONCE AGAIN

The University of California, in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of its foundation, has just published a truly important work in the realms of English and French literature. It is Professor Fernand Baldensperger's *Les Sonnets de Shakespeare traduits en vers français et accompagnés*

d'un commentaire continu (pp xx + 370, \$5.00). As is clear from the title we have here a French translation of the Shakspere sonnets accompanied with a running commentary. What the title does not indicate is that this new French translation—by a man who is a poet in his own right (and therefore more likely than a professional scholar to feel what Shakspere had in his mind and heart)—is faced, sonnet for sonnet, by the English text, that the voluminous notes consist mainly of parallel ideas and expressions from Shakspere's plays and from the works of English and foreign contemporaries, and perhaps—most important—that the new translator-editor has regrouped the sonnets in an attempt to have them tell a new story. What this new story is the reader will have to learn for himself, whether he will be convinced by Dr Baldensperger's case will depend on his knowledge and his prejudices. Unfortunately our knowledge of French is too limited to dare to form an opinion as to the merits of the translation. As to the scholarship shown in the notes, we have no hesitation in saying that we have here a book vastly superior in its independence, industry and honesty than characterizes most books issuing from university and other presses both here and abroad.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

Vol. XVIII

OCTOBER, 1943

No. 4

CONTENTS

PAGE

The <i>Sir Thomas Moore</i> Problem Reconsidered	Paul Deutschberger	156
Satire Concerning the Ale and Wine Trades	Burton Milligan	147
Jaques' Seven Ages	Josephine W. Bennett	168
Shakspere's Heroic Shrew	Raymond A. Houk	175
Polonius's Advice to Laertes	N. B. Allen	187
Editorial Comment—Was Shakspere a Botcher?	S.A.T.	191

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, \$2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary
Copyright, 1943, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

SATIRE CONCERNING THE ALE AND WINE TRADES IN THE SHAKSPERIAN PERIOD AND LATER

BY BURTON MILLIGAN

LITERATURE, particularly the popular literature, of the Tudor and Stuart period contains much satire directed at fraudulent dealing in the ale and wine trades. The purpose of this article is to present some of the conventional satirical charges against brewers, vintners, and ale-sellers and some of the historical evidence bearing upon these charges. The information here presented should be of some value in appraising the degree of conventionality of the references to the ale and wine trades made by Shakspere and other dramatists of the period.

Against the brewers of ale and beer, two main charges were brought: that they watered their brew, and that they used various undesirable or inferior ingredients instead of good hops and malt.

It was the conviction of the satirists that almost all beer was watered until it was intolerably "small." The brewer, indeed, was pictured as growing rich by merely transferring Thames water into his vats and thence, scarcely altered, into his casks and barrels. Condemning this roguery, Nashe, in *Pierce Penilesse* (1592), asserted that the brewers, "by retayling filthy Thames water, come in a few years to be worth fortie or fiftie thousand pound."¹ Greene made the same charge, in *A Quippe for an Upstart Courtier* (1592):

And you masse Brewer, that growe to be worth forty thousand pounds by your selling of soden water, what subtily have you in making your beare, to spare malt & put in the more of the hop, to make your srinke (be barley never so cheap) not a whit the stronger, & yet never sel a whit the more measure for mony.²

Rowlands' *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* (1602) pictured "the Thames most pitifully complaining, what monstrous havocke the Brewers made of her water, without all remorse or compassion."³ The joke concerning watered beer and ale was popular enough, and presumably apt enough, to be taken up by ballad writer, epigrammatist,

and playwright. In the broadside ballad "A Mad Crew: or That Shall be Tried" (c. 1620), the following typical reference is found:

Great store of good liquour the Thames doth contain,
Whereof the old Maltman doth greatly complaine,
That in the hot Kettle, the Mault will not bide,
Well, quoth the brewer, now that shall be tryde.⁴

In Epigram Number 164 of *Upon English Proverbs* (c. 1611), John Davies wrote:

'To cast water in Thames is superfluous';
Not at an ebbe when brewers it use.⁵

In Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (1600), Firk speaks of "the Pissing-Conduit [that] leaks nothing but pure Mother Bunch."⁶

All sorts of undesirable ingredients and adulterants were placed in beer and ale, according to the testimony of the satirists. Indeed, some of the brewing processes that are described are hardly more appetizing than those employed by Elinour Rummimg! Gascoigne's *The Steel Glass* (1576) made the general charge that brewers put "bagage in their beere."⁷ Rowlands' *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* tells of the

abuse committed by such as sell bottle ale, who to make it fly up to the top of the house at the first opening, do put gunpowder into the bottles while the ale is new. Then by stopping it close, make the people believe it is the strength of the ale, when being truly sifted, it is nothing indeed but the strength of the gunpowder that makes the effect, to the great heartburning of the parties that drinks the same.⁸

Sometimes brewers put "willow leaves and broom buds into their woort in steed of hoppes"; sometimes lime was added to beer "to make it mightie."⁹ William Harrison tells us that alewives mixed salt and "rosen" with ale, the former to make drinkers thirsty and the latter to color the ale.¹⁰ If gunpowder, willow leaves, broom buds, salt, resin, and lime were frequent ingredients of beer and ale, one cannot wonder that many protests were voiced. The writer of one of the broadside ballads, "A True Character of Sundry Trades and Callings," summed up the views of the satirists when he wrote:

A Woman without e'er a fault
 she like a bright Star will appear,
 And a Brewer without any mault
 will make but pitiful Beer¹¹

Many of the charges concerning the bad ingredients used in brewing are substantiated by historical evidence. In 1545 the Privy Council issued a warning to certain makers of malt, who "for their pryvate lucre with the contentacion of the buyers deliver forolt [stale] malt, and give v for iiij in their measure. . . ."¹² The profit derived from this chicanery by both the malt dealers and the brewers is obvious. A letter directed by the Privy Council to the Lord Mayor of London, in 1579, charges that brewers did not lower the prices of beer, or increase the quality of it, when the price of its ingredients decreased: "notwithstanding the plentie and cheapnes of malt, the beerebrewers and others did usuallie sell and retaile their beere in like sorte as they did when malt was sold at the double price it now is."¹³ The Lord Mayor was required to reform the abuse. A similar complaint was made by the Privy Council in 1598. The brewers, said the complaint, "verie much overcharged" for their beer "notwithstanding that the price of mault is verie much abated."¹⁴ In 1596 the Council urged the Lord Mayor of London and the Justices of the Peace for the counties of Middlesex and Surrey to examine brewers in and about London. The Council reported that

some of those that have bene before us are chardged to have brewed and sold beere and ale at very excessive and highe pryces, as at xv^{en} and xvij^{en} the barrel, somme of which wee have commytted to pryson and taken order that the rest shalbe bounde to answer this theire contempt the next Terme before us at the Starr Chamber.¹⁵

In 1597, Abraham Campion, "beerebrewer," was accused of having "solde and delivered certaine corrupt and unsavorie beere to the quantitiie of thirtie two tonnes for the provision of her Majestys Navie in the late Voyadge unto Spayne."¹⁶ Perhaps the most detailed testimony, and testimony strongly corroborative of practically every charge made by the satirists, was given by John Stow:

Besides this Want of Measure, there were, about this Time, divers other Things charged upon the Brewers; which I will here set down, together with their Apology and Vindication of themselves; they were charged for their Malt and Hops which they used; as that they

brewed with ill Malt, and in the End of the year they commonly brewed with Weavel Malt, being the Bottom and Sweepings of their Garners, to make Room to bring in new Corn. It was also reported, that they put in Darnel, Rosin, Lime, and Chalk, and such-like; which making the Drinkers thirsty, they might drink the more; and that, for Cheapness, when Hops were dear, they put into their Drink Broom, Bay-berries, Ivy-berries, and such like Things.¹⁷

Rogueries attributed to vintners were the following: mixing bad wine with good, adding lime to sack, watering wine, and giving short measure. The vintner, said Greene, mixed red wine with claret, small rochek with strong gascoigne, and sack with white wine.¹⁸ Dekker described vintners at work after candlelight jumbling together French and Spanish wines.¹⁹ Joseph Hall, in *Virgidemiarum* (1597), contrasting the golden age with his own times, wrote:

Was then no playning of the Brewers scape,
Nor greedie Vintner mixt the stained grape.²⁰

The author of *The Penniless Parliament* (1608) said that "it is thought good, that it shall be lawful for muscadines, in vintners' cellars, to indict their masters of commixtion."²¹ In *I Henry IV*, Falstaff complains:

You rogue, here's lime in this sack too: there is nothing but roguery to be found in villainous man: yet a coward is worse than a cup of sack with lime in it, a villainous coward!²²

The watering of wine appears to have been fairly common. Gascoigne accuses vintners of this trickery and predicts that the millennium will arrive "When vintners mix no water with their wine."²³ A similar reform of the vintners is ironically described in the broadside ballad "News Good and New Too Good to be True" (c. 1625):

No Vintner there [in London] doth mingle
his wine with water pure:
And then doth sweare 'tis neatest:
in London's no such Brewer.²⁴

Typical of the charge that vintners gave short measure is Epigram Number 99 in John Davies' *Upon English Proverbs* (c. 1611):

"The Vintner feares false measure'; How can hee
Fear that he hopes his maintenance shall bee?²⁵

"If wine were as necessary as Bread," wrote Samuel Butler in his character "A Vintner" (c. 1667), "he would stand in the Pillory for selling false Measure, as well as the Bakers do for false Weight."²⁶ In connection with the accusations

concerning short measures, it is significant that earlier in the century several turners—that is, makers of wooden measures—had taken an oath that “in future they will not make any other measures than gallons, potelle, and quarts; and that they will make no false measures. . . .”²⁷

The tricks of tapsters and alewives to defraud the public were varied and ingenious, and some of them have modern parallels. The sellers of ale and beer gave short measure, by “frothing,” “nicking,” and other tricks; they overcharged and reckoned falsely; they sold adulterated drinks.

“Frothing” was probably the simplest means of giving short measure and certainly the most common, just as it is today. A glass or a can a third or half filled with foam represented a cheat to the customer but a profit to the tavern or alehouse. “Froth your cans well in the filling . . . and job your bottles o’ the buttock, sirrah,”²⁸ was the instruction given by Ursula, in Jonson’s *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), to Mooncalf, the tapster at her stand. The accusation of frothing was so common, the joke so familiar, that in some plays—for instance, Shakspere’s *Measure for Measure* and Massinger’s *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*—the Tapsters were named Froth. Writers of broadside ballads referred frequently to tapsters’ practice of frothing. One of them wrote:

When tapsters will not thrive by froth,
And to score two for one are loth,
And all old scores are paid in haste,
Why then, I think, the worst is past.²⁹

Another, referring to the tapster, said:

But the chiefest fault in him we finde,
he doth fill his cans with froth.³⁰

Still another writer bewailed the fact that

The Tapster [was] still living
by foame and by froth.³¹

Other references of like tenor are numerous, both in broadside ballads and in other forms of literature.³²

Another form of cheating was that known as “nicking.” This term is somewhat confusing, for it was used by writers of the time to refer to two distinctly different rogueries: (1) keeping false reckonings on the notched sticks used for tallies, and (2) using beer cans, jugs, or glasses that were

short in measure because of false bottoms, indentations, or other deliberately contrived imperfections. That the confusion arising from these two meanings is not great is due to the fact that in most references "nicking" is clearly used in the second sense. The following lines from George Wither's *The Scourge* (1617) make what I consider to be the general distinction of the writers between "nicking," in the sense of using short measures, and "misreckoning":

His [the tapster's], best revenue is by Nicke and Froth;
Which priviledge to loose, they would be loth.
And there's an old shift (if they leave it not)
There must be something added to the shot.³³

The short-measure cans, pots, and jugs of the tapster were the target of much invective. Rowlands complained, in *Greenes Ghost Haunting Conicatchers* (1602), of the tapsters' "fubbing off" their customers with "those slender wasted blacke pots and Cannes, that will hold little more than a Sering."³⁴ John Taylor, in *The Great Eater of Kent* (1630), wrote of the tapsters' "curtoll Cannes, tragically blacke-pots, and double-dealing bombasted Jugges."³⁵ The broadside "Nick and Froth; or The Good-fellow's Complaint for Want of Full Measure" (c. 1665) complains of "counterfeit" beer flagons:

For those that drink Beer, 'tis true as I'm here
Your counterfeit flaggons you have,
Which holds not a quart, scarce by a third part,
And that makes my Hostis go brave.³⁶

The same ballad makes melancholy comment concerning the general practice of nicking and frothing, and its effect upon convivial patrons:

Scarce one house in twenty, where measure is plenty,
But still they are all for the Pinch;
Thus every day, they drive custom away,
And force us good fellows to flinch.³⁷

John Stephens' character "A Tapster" (1615) remarks cynically on short measures:

He attributes the scant measure of his Jugge to the Cellars darknesse, and his saving nature; but rather then he will justifie both, he hath a certaine slight of hand to fill the first glasse, and so avoyds inquisition.³⁸

In "Robin Conscience," a late seventeenth-century broadside, the hostess at an alehouse brags:

Instead of a quart pot of pewter,
I fill small jugs, and need no tutor.³⁹

Tapsters' misreckonings of scores were frequently satirized. A typical reference is the following in one of the ballads:

Your Tapster is growne a right honest man,
For he will misreckon no more than he can.⁴⁰

"Drink with all companies, though you be sure to be drunk," is the advice of Ursula to Mooncalf, the tapster, in Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair*; you'll misreckon the better, and be less ashamed on't."⁴¹ In Nabbes' *Tottenham Court* (1633) the Tapster overcharges Changelove. A quarrel ensues, and after Changelove pays the false reckoning, the Tapster admits, "I have ore-reckon'd one and twenty pence."⁴² According to Head's *The English Rogue* (1665) it was the habit of tapsters to use "the crotched chalk to score up two flaggons for one."⁴³ In *Vinegar and Mustard* (1673), "a right reverend fat Hostess" rebukes her husband for honest reckoning:

Thou art such an innocent fool, that thou seest thy guests pot-shaken,
and have lost their memories, yet you must tell them their just reck-
oning without overplus⁴⁴

The tapsters' habit of selling adulterated beer or ale was satirized by various writers. The beer the tapsters sold was often a mixture, said Greene, of poor beer and good: "halfe smal and halfe stong."⁴⁵ Lime was sometimes added to beer to make it froth more, a roguery which the Hostess in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* requested Bardolph to execute.⁴⁶ Sometimes musty ale was sold, a trick referred to in Massinger's *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (c. 1626) when Justice Greedy accuses Tapwell and Froth of selling ale of this sort.⁴⁷ Bung, the knavish tapster in *The London Chanticleers* (c. 1636), proposes to "put off the barrel of sour beer by and by" on a wedding party.⁴⁸ Head asserted that it was one of the tricks of tapsters to serve good beer when the company first came in and "drappings of the tap" when they were half drunk.⁴⁹ The popular reputation of the tapster is shown by a proverb current as early as the sixteenth century: "Tapsters and ostlers are not always the honestest men."⁵⁰

In conclusion, one may emphasize the fact that the charges made by the satirists against brewers and vintners are rather thoroughly corroborated by historical evidence. In spite of

the fact that certain accusations and jests seem conventionalized, the evidence indicates that the satirists were attacking genuine and contemporary evils. As to the satire directed at tapsters, the weight of corroborative historical data is lacking, probably because their knaveries were too trivial to gain much attention from the authorities; but there seems good reason here, too, to conclude that the satirists were representing actual conditions with a high degree of accuracy.

University of Illinois.

¹*Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, 5 vols. (London, 1910), I, 173.

²*Life and Complete Works*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart, 15 vols. (London, 1881-1886), XI, 274.

³*Complete Works of Samuel Rowlands*, ed. E. W. Gosse and Sidney Hertage, 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1880), I, 8.

⁴*Pepys Ballads*, ed. Hyder Rollins, 8 vols. (Harvard University Press, 1929-1931), I, 192.

⁵*Complete Works of John Davies of Hereford*, ed. Grosart, 2 vols. (Edinburgh University Press, 1878), II, 45.

⁶IV, iv.

⁷*Works*, ed. J. W. Cunliffe, 2 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1910), II, 71.

⁸*Op. cit.*, I, 9.

⁹*Ibid.*, I, 8. "Woort," says *NED*, is an "infusion of malt or other grain which after fermentation becomes beer."

¹⁰*Description of England*, ed. F. J. Furnivall, New Shakspere Society, Series 6, I, 161.

¹¹*Roxburghe Ballads*, ed. William Chappell and J. W. Ebsworth, 9 vols. (London, 1871), VII, 18.

¹²*Acts of the Privy Council of England*, ed. J. R. Dasent, 32 vols. (London, 1890-1907), I, 246.

¹³*Ibid.*, XI, 268.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, XXIX, 143.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, XXVI, 542.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, XXVIII, 249.

¹⁷*A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, ed. John Strype, 2 vols. (London, 1754), II, 289.

¹⁸*Op. cit.*, XI, 278-9.

¹⁹*The Seven Deadly Sinnes of London*, ed. H. F. B. Brett-Smith (Oxford, 1922), pp. 32-33.

²⁰*Complete Poems*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (Manchester, 1879), p. 62.

²¹*Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, ed. C. Hindley, 3 vols. (London, 1871-3), II, 6.

²²II, iv, 139-142.

²³*Op. cit.*, II, 171.

²⁴*A Pepysian Garland*, ed. Hyder Rollins (Cambridge University Press, 1922), p. 218. Cf. Tale XV, *Morris Tales of Skelton* (c 1566): "Howe the vinteners wife put water in Skelton's wine."

²⁵*Op. cit.*, II, 43.

²⁶*Characters and Passages from Note-Books*, ed. A. R. Waller (Cambridge University Press, 1908), p. 165.

²⁷H. T. Kiley, *Memorials of London and London Life* (London, 1868), p. 78.

²⁸II, i.

²⁹"The Worst is Past," *Roxburghe Ballads*, III, 71. This ballad, according to Chappell, was published between 1635 and 1642.

³⁰"A Very Pleasant New Ditty," *Pepys Ballads*, ed. Rollins, I, 253. Published c. 1625.

³¹"The Silver Age, or The World Turned Backward" (1621), *Pepys Ballads*, I, 204.

³²See, for example, Greene, *Works*, ed. Grosart, IX, 275; Beaumont, *The Knight of*

the Burning Pestle, II, vi; *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 474, VI, 487

³³*Juvenilia*, 2 vols. (Spenser Society, 1871), II, 341.

³⁴*Works*, I, 8. "Sering" is an obsolete form of "syringe."

³⁵*The Works of John Taylor, reprinted from Folio of 1630* (Spenser Society, 1868), p. 154.

³⁶*Roxburghe Ballads*, VI, 487

³⁷*Ibid.*

³⁸*Satirical Essays, Characters, and Others* (London, 1615), p. 273.

³⁹*Harleian Miscellany*, 10 vols. (London, 1808-1813), I, 70

⁴⁰"A Dialogue betweene Master Guesright and poore Neighbour Needly," *Roxburghe Ballads*, I, 232.

⁴¹II, 1

⁴²IV, vii

⁴³*The English Rogue*, 4 vols (London, 1874), II, 82

⁴⁴*The Old Book Collector's Miscellany*, ed. Hindley, III, 4.

⁴⁵*Op. cit.*, XI, 275.

⁴⁶I, iii, 14

⁴⁷IV, ii.

⁴⁸Scene xiii.

⁴⁹*Op. cit.*, II, 82.

⁵⁰Apperson, *English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases* (New York, 1929), under "Tapster."

THE SIR THOMAS MOORE PROBLEM RECONSIDERED

(*Conclusion*)

BY PAUL DEUTSCHBERGER

Part II

OF THE two lines of argument marshalled to prove Shakspere's collaboration in *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, we have already disposed of the first. In discussing the aesthetic case one is always confronted by a major methodological difficulty—the deeper one goes, the more enmeshed one becomes in opinion and counter-opinion. But with the second line of argument, the palaeographic, the scholar stands on solid ground in which there is an ultimate, appeal to fact.

We may, at the very outset, reject the graphiological assertions of Richard Simpson, since he assigned the whole play to only three hands. He was incapable of distinguishing between the writings on folios 7b, 8a, 8b, 9a, 11bb, 12a, 12b, 13a, and 14aa; all of which he naively attributed to Shakspere because “the way in which the letters are formed is absolutely the same as the way in which they are formed in the signature of Shakspere”—an assertion which all now admit to be a patent absurdity.

Although James Spedding, a year later, was able to limit the possible Shakspere contribution to folios 8 and 9, he did this on stylistic grounds, though he claimed that the writing is in a hand “which answers to all we know about Shakespeare's.”²² What Spedding knew about Shakspere's handwriting amounted to nothing more than that he wrote the Secretary script, as did all his contemporaries.

Spedding and R. W. Chambers dismiss the evidence of the manuscript which (had Shakspere written it) disproves the statement of Heminge and Condell as to Shakspere's fluency and freedom from corrections; the manuscript shows that D did not write with the ease and fluency which Heminge and Condell said was Shakspere's way. In lines 234-258 D is so

balled-up in writing a certain passage that he scratches, emends, adds, and then cancels almost all of it, leaving only a limping and unintelligible line. That cannot be how Shakspere wrote.

It was not until 1916, however, that an attempt was made to put the problem on less hypothetical grounds. In that year, E. M. Thompson, in *Shakspeare's Handwriting*, tried to demonstrate the correspondence between six of Shakspere's signatures³ and the writing of the Addition. Subsequently, realizing the validity of criticisms and objections brought against his case, Thompson revised it, retracting some of his main points, in *Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More* (1923), pages 57 to 112.

Notwithstanding the fact that Thompson himself did not claim that his analysis settled the question⁴ his followers⁵ are not so cautious or moderate in their claims. They refuse to realize that, despite Sir Edward's revision, his essay does not stand up under objective criticism; that it contains many statements which are either ill-founded or unsubstantiable. Four major charges must be made against Thompson's case: first, that it is based upon faulty observation; second, his deductions are invalid; third, his knowledge of Elizabethan calligraphic habits was inadequate; finally, he focussed his attention wholly upon a few so-called graphiological "peculiarities," believing that if he could show these "peculiarities" to be present both in the Addition and in the Shakspere signatures, it would prove Shakspere the author of the 147 lines in question.

The last mentioned line of argument would be valid if the alleged peculiarities occurred nowhere else but in Shakspere and in D. They are, however, duplicated in hundreds of fifteenth and sixteenth century manuscripts. Furthermore, it can be shown that Thompson was mistaken in some of his observations: that he saw things in the Addition and the signatures which are not there, and that he failed to see, or ignored, peculiarities in the Addition which are not to be found in the signatures.

Not much of Thompson's proof is currently accepted.⁶

Greg⁷ and E. K. Chambers are willing to let the "peculiarities" go, preferring to rely on "numerous hardly definable traits of resemblance."⁸ But traits that cannot be defined do not exist for the scientific expert, and are admissible only in the realm of the occult.

Inasmuch as the handwriting case is the essential one, we shall reconsider Sir Edward's case and summarize the points made by Dr. Tannenbaum in his various studies of this subject.

1. The use of a flourish ending in a minute curl or dot at the end of terminal letters of words in the Addition Thompson holds characteristic of Shakspere's hand. He thinks there may be such flourishes in the signatures, but he admits that if they are there they are so imperfect that their identity is doubtful. An examination with a magnifying glass or pocket microscope reveals that there is not a single such terminal flourish in the extant Shakspere autographs.

2. Thompson alleges that of the various forms of the letter *k* "Shakspeare makes use in the few signatures of three out of four forms . . . which appear in the Addition." But, the *k* of the Deposition signature nowhere occurs in the Addition; neither does the scrivener's normal *k* of the Addition appear in the signatures. Further, the *k* found on the second page of the will, which Thompson identifies with some of the *k*'s in the Addition, is a very common one in Secretary script, as may be seen from Richard Gethinge's *Calligraphotechnia* (1616). This point is, therefore, irrelevant.

3. Thompson goes on: "Various forms that the letter *p* assumes in the Addition are found also in the signatures." The *p*'s of the Addition and the *p*'s in the signatures are undistinctive variations of a model Secretary "p"; furthermore the *p*'s in the Addition do not correspond in details with those of the signatures.⁹ Finally, in his discussion of the *pe* combination found in the second word of "Peace, peace, scilens, peace" (line 50), Thompson was completely misled. It is obvious that he did not understand how the letters were written. The *p* he describes as a "short truncated letter, not unlike an ordinary printer's Roman lower-case *p* having a short vertical stem commencing with a small hook

or serif on the left; then a short horizontal bar is drawn to form the base of the head-loop, which is completed by the addition of the necessary curve." Neither the *p*'s in Shakspere's signatures, nor the small *p*'s in the Addition were ever written in that manner.

Only one truncated *p* appears in any of the signatures, in the signature to the Mortgage.¹⁰ That such *p*'s were not unfamiliar to Elizabethan penmen may be gathered from a holograph letter of Sir John Harrington¹¹, in which at least six such "p's" appear. Besides, there is one variety of *p* which seems characteristic of D¹² and does not occur at all in the signatures.

Again, the *e* of this *pe* combination is a common variant of the formal shape of that letter, and may be found in almost any specimen of the Secretary hand.

4. In connection with the "a" in the word "that" (line 105), Thompson asserts that neither he nor J. P. Gilson had ever found a specimen of an "open *a* . . . formed with a spur at the back, which is no essential part of it, but seems to be a personal mark of the hand," and occurs only in D and in Shakspere.

But examples of the horizontal *a*-spur are the rule in George Chapman's hand.¹³ In Edward Grimeston's holographs many of these are to be found.¹⁴ C, in *Sir Thomas Moore*, imparts a slightly curved horizontal spur to the second *a* in "hazard," second line from the bottom of folio 11bb. To these may be added examples from the handwriting of Edmund Spenser, John Knox, and Ben Jonson.¹⁵ It is a common feature in Elizabethan documents.

5. Thompson's treatment of the *s*, both capital and small, leaves the critical reader more than merely suspicious of his sincerity and scientific temper.

Early in the essay Thompson declares that the Addition "is written entirely by one hand." Even his followers concede that this is not so. It is admitted now that there are additions and marginal notations by C. Yet a large part of Thompson's

argument is based upon his inclusion of this material among the writing of D—a procedure as preposterous as attempting to identify a criminal by attributing to a suspect the features of his neighbor.

Thompson asserted, erroneously, that the (italic) long *s* was the only letter of the Italian alphabet that Shakspere adopted in his signatures. "This *s* occurs in the word 'seriant' (line 17 marg.) and is added in a minute size as a correction to the word 'warre' (line 113)." But there is not a single italic *s* in the whole of the Addition in the hand of D. Where it does appear, in "seriant," it is in C's hand. The *s* in "warres," moreover, is not the italic letter, but is a normal, exceedingly common variety of final Gothic "*s*," resembling an Arabic 6, such as was generally used as a terminal letter in Shakspere's day. Yet as late as 1939, R. W. Chambers still stuck to this point, obviously because he realized that without it Thompson's case went to pot.¹⁶

In his revised treatment of the matter, Sir Edward admitted that he was wrong in his observation and comments on the long *s*. He says: "some of my friends, experts in phalæography, who have examined the passage more closely than I have had the opportunity of doing, have given an opinion . . . that the supposed Italian long *s* is nothing more than a pen flourish finishing off the scrawl on one of the deleted strokes" on a word crossed out in line 103. *Who have examined the passage more closely!* Sir Edward's honesty here is, indeed, admirable, but such an admission must reflect upon the value of the paper which stands as the foundation of the entire argument. What are we to think of the value of expert testimony which admits that it identified a mere flourish for one of the unique and distinctive features of Shakspere's handwriting? By his admission, Sir Edward justifies us in thinking that he had not scanned any of the questioned writing closely.

5. Thompson refers to Shakspere's habit of occasionally making long initial upstrokes on some of his letters, *e.g.*, in the *B*, *m*, and the *W* of "By me William" on the last page of the will. He points out that the one on the *W* leads off with a finely drawn narrow opening which resembles a needle-eye, and which, he claims, is a formation so rare as

to suggest a personal peculiarity by which Shakspere can be distinguished from all other Elizabethan penmen.

It should be needless to say that such initial upstrokes are a feature of many fluent hands; and, therefore, have no identifying value. But, Sir Edward does not rest his case solely on the long upstroke. Finding an instance of a similar needle-eye formation in the upstroke to the *n* of "needs" (line 130 of the Addition), he exclaims enthusiastically, "Is it reasonable to imagine that two different writers should possess the same trick or turn of hand which could thus produce a figure so identical in form in two separate documents?" It certainly is reasonable. Dr. Tannenbaum has found the identical feature in Chapman's holograph inscription to his *Batrachomyomachia*¹⁷. Curiously enough another example occurs elsewhere in the *Moore* manuscript (!) in the margin of line 31, folio 13b, in the word "Morr" (written by Thomas Dekker)

6. Thompson talks of "minute hyphens" between words, but none such appear in the manuscript. There are occasionally tiny marks made by the pen as it moved from word to word.

7. Thompson claims that the long *s* never post-links with the letter *c*—but just such a linking occurs in line 21 of folio 8a. We mention this only to show what a careless observer Sir Edward really was.

8. He declares that the capital *S* with a sharp chin to the right is exceptionally rare, and of significance because it is common to both Shakspere and D. The fact is that this chin formation is almost universal in Elizabethan documents.¹⁸

There is, however, one important point in Thompson's case that has not yet been satisfactorily answered, and which now requires our consideration.

Sir Edward, it may be recalled, opens his argument with an attempt to confirm the assertion that Shakspere was the victim of a nervous disorder,¹⁹ writer's cramp, a theory

already enunciated by Dr. R. W. Leftwich.²⁰ If this had been true, we might perhaps have an explanation for some of the manifold differences between the fluent writing of the Addition and the signatures written at least two decades later.²¹ By introducing the theory of writer's cramp to explain why the Addition and the signatures differ Sir Edward admits that the two writings are not alike. But he implies that they would have been alike if Shakspere had not suffered from writer's cramp.

It is obvious that Thompson has immeasurably weakened his case, for, with the introduction of the hypothesis that Shakspere's hand underwent a violent change from about 1613 to 1616, Sir Edward destroys the testimony of five out of the six signatures he accepts as genuine. Eighty-three per cent of his standard for comparison cannot therefore be considered as representative of Shakspere's hand about 1593-1594.

But is it a fact that Shakspere suffered from the spastic condition known as writer's cramp? Sir Edward claims that he did, and relies upon the opinions of Drs. Nisbet and Leftwich. But a reading of Leftwich and Nisbet shows that neither was a neurologist or knew what the nature of writer's cramp is. Furthermore, neither of them claimed to have studied the penmanship of victims of the disease, and neither had any acquaintance with the Secretary script.

Dr. Charles L. Dana, a New York neurologist of distinction, who had made a special study of writer's cramp, could not find a single evidence of the disease in any of Shakspere's signatures.²² Dr. Tannenbaum, himself a doctor of medicine and a psychiatrist, has pointed out²³ that writer's cramp does not affect the basic patterns of the victim's letters. It follows that we must regard the Addition and the signatures the work of two different hands, for Sir Edward has very clearly put himself in the position of saying that but for writer's cramp the two writings would have been alike.

In his comments on writer's cramp Thompson refers to the *S* on the third page of the poet's will. Shakspere, says he, "conscious of inability to control his hand when attempt-

ing a curve in reverse action . . . under embarrassing circumstances, as in the present execution of his will," allowed the base curve of the *S* to become entangled with the body of the letter itself, instead of being continued leftward as an inclosing semi-circle." The avoid "embarrassment" in subscribing the signature to the second page of the will, Shakspere "shirks the difficult moment of the curve by leaving a gap in the back of the embracing semi-circle." Sir Edward then proceeds to examine the earlier signatures for further indications of this hypothetical disorder. In the Deposition signature (1612) he notices the break in the base-curve of the *S*, but finds no evidence of disease. The pen, here, he says, had traveled so rapidly "that the ink failed to follow its course throughout and left only a trace in a portion of the base-curve." In the Conveyance and Mortgage-Deed signatures (1613), however, the crucial *S* "reveals sufficient indications of embarrassment to show that the writer was conscious of weakness of hand in forming that letter of alternating curves."

But we have seen that the signatures do not show evidence of writer's cramp. In not considering the construction of the *S* in the Deposition, in not comparing it with the "embarrassed" *S* of the second page of the will, Sir Edward most grievously erred. The *S* in the signature to the second page of the will is identical with the *S* of the Deposition in all essential details.

In short, to explain this omission of the base-curve we need not follow Sir Edward into the realm of psychopathology. Dr. Tannenbaum, who for some years has been studying this particular problem, informs me that in quick and skilful writing most penmen, in attempting to make a leftward curve at the bottom of a letter, tend to relax the pressure upon the pen, often even to lift it entirely from the paper. (Present-day writers often omit the curved stroke connecting the descender and the ascender of the letters *y* and *g*.) We may therefore, says Dr. Tannenbaum, expect any letter with a curve running from right to left at the base to be defective. In the Secretary *per* symbol, in the *p*, and most frequently in the *L*, *J*, and *S*, when written quickly, the base or infralinear loop may appear as a succession of

distinct dots or be entirely wanting. Most frequently, however, the base curve, the loop, or the back of the capital *S* appears as a faint line.

That the missing base-curve of the *S* in Shakspere's signature is not an indication of writer's cramp is obvious from the occurrence of similarly defective *S*'s in Dekker's handwriting.²⁴ It occurs in the hand of the clerk who copied Shakspere's will. See for instance the first *S* of "Susanna," lines fourteen and sixteen on the second page of that document. On line eight of the same page, the *S* of "Stratford" wants the base curve; while the initial *S* of "Shakspeare" in line 9, third page of the will like that of the *Deposition*, has a base curve composed of a series of dots. Such *S*'s may be found as early as the fourteenth century²⁵, and there is a beautiful example of it in the manuscript of *Wit and Wisdom*, 5 verso, top, in the word "Severitie."²⁶

As to the other letters, we may find many *L*'s in the will showing a defective loop at the back near the bottom; especially in line eleven, page three, in "Leases."²⁷ In the manuscript of *Wit and Science*, line fifty-nine, page sixty-two, we find a similarly defective *I* in "Ignorance." *Per symbols*²⁸, *y*'s²⁹, and even *T*'s³⁰ with incomplete loops are not difficult to find. That similar gaps are left even in certain flourishes is to be seen in a curious example of an *E* in the handwriting of Nicholas Breton.³¹

Furthermore, the most common feature at the back of the capital *S* in the Secretary script is the fact that the stroke does not form a perfect arc. The tendency, it seems, was to construct the arc out of a series of short angular strokes, a fact of which Thompson, according to Leftwich, seems to have been cognizant.³² The shaky initial *S* in the signature on the third page of the will is therefore not a pathological formation.

As to the supporting testimony of the signatures to the Conveyance and the Mortgage Deed, that can be dismissed as valueless. The *S* of the Conveyance is obviously a normal specimen; and the signature to the Mortgage is now known to owe its peculiar characteristics to the fact that the parch-

ment surface on which it was written was too greasy to take the ink.³³

Sir Edward's case is, therefore, in every detail illogical, unscientific, inconsequential and invalid.

But, even though Sir Edward's case has been shown to be worthless, the question may be asked whether a more scientific examination than his might not, after all, show the Addition to be Shakspere's. That this is really impossible follows from Tannenbaum's tabulation of the differences between the writings in question.³⁴ He points out that the writing of the Addition is smaller and "more compressed, huddled, close-knit." The writing of the signatures shows less freedom than that of the Addition. "The writer of the Addition has a freedom and a swing in his writing, most conspicuous in his capitals, in the reversed loops of his *d*'s and in the long loops of his *y*'s and *h*'s, which is wholly unlike the writing in the unquestioned signatures." The constraint Shakspere shows in the writing of his signatures is shown in his almost constant substitution of angles for curves. Tannenbaum finds, furthermore, that, in general, Shakspere's strokes are heavier than those of the writer of the Addition. Shakspere usually begins and ends his strokes abruptly, whereas D's writing ends with a fine hairline. In his signatures Shakspere never dotted an *i*; D was meticulous in dotting his *i*'s. Whereas Shakspere apparently did not tend to link his letters, *D* frequently wrote whole words without a pen-lift. Significantly, Shakspere's signatures employ several signs indicating abbreviation; in all of the 147 lines, D uses but one type, and that sparingly. Shakspere's *W*'s and those of D are strikingly different in pattern, as are their *l*'s. Since Shakspere seems to have been fond of the ornamental indented *l*, Tannenbaum is quite right in saying that the complete absence of this form of the letter in the three folio pages of the manuscript "is almost sufficient in itself to disprove Shaksperian authorship for them." Shakspere's *a*'s differ in form and variety from those in the Addition. Not a single *m* in the *Moore*-fragment ends in the manner Shakspere's *m*'s do. Shakspere's *h*'s and those of D are dissimilar, the difference in shading, for one thing, indicating, as do the capital *S*'s, that D wrote more rapidly than Shakspere

and used the left nib of the pen more than he. It may be added that Shakspere seldom linked the *h* and the *a* in his signatures. D clearly makes such a ligature in sixty-six instances out of a total of eighty occurrences of this combination in the Addition.

That Shakspere's *B*'s and those of D are wholly unlike in their conception and execution was early pointed out by Mrs. Stopes and Mr. Bayfield³⁶, sufficient evidence to prove that we are dealing with two different penmen.

We are therefore driven to only one conclusion: Shakspere did not write the Addition in the anonymous play of *Sir Thomas Moore*.

NOTES TO PART II

¹*Notes and Queries*, July 1st 1871, p. 3.

²*Notes and Queries*, Sept. 21, 1872, p. 228.

³The six attached to legal documents: Deposition, May 11, 1612, Conveyance, March 10, 1613; Mortgage-Deed, March 11, 1613; and the three to the will, probably subscribed March 25, 1616.

⁴*Sb's H* and in *STM*, p. 72, "though it does not at once carry conviction, yet it claims the right of being duly weighed."

⁵A. W. Pollard, *Sb's H.* in *STM*, p. 13-14; Pollard, *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, 2d ed., 1937, xxii; R. W. Leftwich, *Shakespeare's Handwriting*, n.d., 20; R. W. Chambers, *Man's Unconquerable Mind* (1939), pp. 239ff.

⁶It was neatly demolished by Tannenbaum, *SP*, 22:133-60.

⁷*TLS*, Nov. 24, Dec. 1, 1927; concedes that two of the four most important points "must be abandoned as doubtful," and that "the other two are somewhat reduced in force."

⁸William Shakespeare, 1:508.

⁹Tannenbaum, *SP*, 22:142-143.

¹⁰For an explanation of the peculiar characteristics of this signature *v.*, Tannenbaum, *Problems in Shakspere's Penmanship*, 1927, pp. 47-65.

¹¹Greg, *English Literary Autographs*, II, plate xlvi.

¹²e.g., in "ampler" (line 101); "captains" (line 114).

¹³Greg, *English Literary Autographs*, I, plate xii.

¹⁴Marcham, *The King's Office of the Revels*, 1925, facing page 6.

¹⁵Tannenbaum, *SP*, 22:139-141.

¹⁶MLR, 26:274. This essay was reprinted in 1939 in *Man's Unconquerable Mind*.

¹⁷Original in Harvard Library. A facsimile of this is shown in Tannenbaum's *Shakspere and Sir Thomas Moore*, facing p. 16.

¹⁸See Chapman's writing, Greg, *op. cit.*, plate xii.

¹⁹Originally propounded by Nisbet, *The Insanity of Genius* (1891), pp. 146-162.

²⁰*Shakespeare's Handwriting*, n.d., pp. 7-20.

²¹Thompson accepts 1593-94 as the probable date of the Addition.

²²"Handwriting in Nervous Diseases," *Essays in Honor of Morton Prince*, 1925. (See *Problems in Sb's Penmanship*.)

²³*SP*, 22:136-138.

²⁴Greg, *English Literary Autographs*, I, plate x, "Somme," "Sett."

²⁵Jenkinson, *Later Court Hand in England*, 1927, suppl. plate xxii, sect. ii, line 1, "Seignour."

²⁶*Tudor Facsimile Texts* rep., 1907.

²⁷Jenkinson, *op. cit.*, plate xix, line 17.

²⁸*Ibid.*, plate xxxi, line 15, part II; plate I, line 14.

²⁹*Ibid.*, plate xxxiv, lines 9 and 31.

³⁰*Ibid.*, plate xix, line 25.

³¹Greg, *English Literary Autographs*, II, plate xxxv, "Emploiment."

³²Leftwich, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

³³See note 10.

³⁴V., note 12.

³⁵SP, 22:147-156.

³⁶Stopes, *TLS*, May 29, 1919, p. 295; June 19, 1919, p. 537; Bayfield, *TLS*, May 15, 1919, p. 265; May 29, 1919, p. 295; June 5, 1919, p. 312; June 30, 1921, p. 418; also Aug. 18, 1921.

JAQUES' SEVEN AGES

BY JOSEPHINE W. BENNETT

SINCE criticism can be sound only when it is based on and supported by sound scholarship, Professor O. J. Campbell's re-interpretation of the character of Jaques, in his study of *Shakspeare's Satire*,¹ makes timely a reconsideration of the whole question of the source of Jaques' most famous speech. Professor Campbell rejects the common opinion that Jaques voices Shakspere's own dissatisfaction with life, and argues that "Jaques is a malcontent traveller anatomized according to the approved psychology of Shakespeare's day;" and that he is treated by the poet, not sympathetically, but satirically.

It has long been known that Jaques' account of the seven ages of man followed a popular pattern of thought; but no close verbal parallel has been established, and it is customary to regard the account as derived from pictorial rather than from verbal sources.² Recently the subject was reopened by Professor J. W. Draper, who advanced the argument that the enumeration of *seven* ages was not common, and that a passage in *Bartholomaeus Anglicus* was Shakspere's direct source.³ The parallel lies chiefly in the fact that both enumerate *seven* ages, and Professor Allan H. Gilbert very justly pointed out the fallacy of the contention that seven was an unusual number.⁴ He cities *Censorinus De die Natali liber*, which describes divisions of man's life into five, seven, four and ten ages. Professor Don Cameron Allen has added a reference to the *Silva de varia lecion* of Pedro Mexia⁵ which he quotes in a French translation, but which Shakspere could have seen in the English version of Thomas Fortescue.⁶ Mexia says that Pythagoras divided man's life into four parts, according to the seasons of the year; M. Varro names five parts of fifteen years each, Hippocrates names seven, Solon ten, Isidore and some others made only six; Horace like Pythagoras, names four, Aristotle considers only three, and most of the Arabs follow him, but Avicenna has 4, Servius Tullius (in A. Gellius) has only three, but Mexia himself described seven. He says:

By the common division of Astrologians, as well *Arabes*, *Caldees*, *Grecos*, and *Latines*: as also by the particular opinion of *Proclus*,

Ptolomie, and *La Rasellus*, the life of Man is devided in seven Ages, over every one of which ruleth and governeth one of the seven Planetes.

Infancy, he goes on to explain, is governed by the Moon, childhood by Mercury, adolescence by Venus, young manhood by the Sun, maturity (*Aetas virilis*) by Mars, age by Jupiter, and old age by Saturn.

Here we have the basis for what was, unquestionably, a very popular division into *seven* ages.⁷ The other widely mentioned account of the seven ages is attributed to Hippocrates.⁸ It is largely concerned with fixing the age limits of the various periods, but says that the first age, of seven years, is characterized by the shedding of teeth, the second by puberty, the third by the development of the beard. The fourth extends to the twenty-eighth year, the fifth to the forty-ninth, the sixth to the age of fifty-six, after which old age begins. The authority of this ancient physician is particularly important because the Elizabethans believed firmly in the "climacteric." The year of change from one age to another was a critical one, and the ages were so divided as to bring the change on some multiple of seven. Solon's ten ages were allotted seven years each.⁹ Astrology, medicine, and numerology combined to make the seven ages by far the most popular division of human life. although both in literature and in art divisions into any number of ages from three twelve may be found.¹⁰

But, except for the use of the number seven, Shakspere's account has little in common with either the medical or the astrological convention. He is concerned with appearance and behavior, and his point of view is satiric. It is not surprising, therefore, that critics have assumed that his lines were inspired rather by a picture of the seven ages than by a verbal account.¹¹

But there were verbal accounts of the ages of man which have been overlooked, but which are much closer to Shakspere's lines than any so far noticed. Shakspere was not original in combining his description of the ages of man's life with the notion that "all the world's a stage." Marcellus Palingenius Stellatus, in his *Zodiacus Vitae*, begins his

account of the ages of man's life with the statement that life is a pageant; Barnabe Googe, in his translation, adds the gloss, "The world a stage play."¹² This whole book of the *Zodiacus* is devoted to the subject of the folly and futility of human life. It is much in the spirit of Jaques' remarks, and since the *Zodiacus* was widely known and even used as a schoolbook, it is not improbable that in writing Jaques' speech Shakspere intended to recall this passage to his hearers' minds. Palingenius describes the infant as crying, the child was disciplined by masters and parents, the youth as rash, amorous, and ready for brawls. Manhood brings care, labor, and ambition, as well as honor. Old age is marked by grey hair, failing senses, loss of teeth, and dotage.

Some lines, once attributed to Ralegh, seem to be based on this passage in Palingenius. They are headed "De Morte."

Man's life's a tragedy: his mother's womb,
 From which he enters, is his tiring-room;
 This spacious earth the theatre; and the stage
 That country which he lives in: passions, rage,
 Folly, and vice are actors: the first cry
 The prologue to the ensuing tragedy.
 The former act consisteth of dumb-shows,
 The second, he to more perfection grows,
 I'th'third he is a man, and doth begin
 To nurture vice, and act the deeds of sin:
 I'th' fourth declines; i'th'fifth diseases clog
 And trouble him; then death's his epilogue.¹³

Here we have the moralizing spirit of Jaques and the combination of the idea that "all the world's a stage" with the account of the ages of man.¹⁴ But Palingenius describes only five ages.

The *Onomasticon* of Julius Pollux, a Greek grammarian of the second century A.D., has an account of "the seven ages according to Hippocrates" which includes many striking parallels to Shakspere's lines.¹⁵ The text of the *Onomasticon* was recovered by Filelfo and printed in Greek, with a Latin index, by Aldus in 1502. There were several editions, including one by A. F. Varchiese (1520) dedicated to Thomas Linacre. In 1536 Grynaeus edited it at Basel where, in 1541, the first Latin translation, by R. Gualther, was published. This was the only translation available in the

sixteenth century, and is the one, therefore, which I shall quote.

The *Onomasticon* is a thesaurus, arranged topically rather than alphabetically, and the second book opens with the account of the seven ages of man (pp. 74-78). The paragraphs are numbered, and the first is devoted to Hippocrates' account. The second is "De Hominis Partibus," and the third supplies words for conception, abortion, and parturition. The fourth supplies words descriptive "De Infantibus." These are mostly nouns and noun phrases, but the section ends, "lacents sugens, mamillis uniuens, nuper a fœmina semotus, nuper ablactatus." The construction, as well as the words, are suggestive of Shakspere's infant "Mewling and puking in the nurse's arms." Paragraph V, "De puerulis" has only two lines, but Pollux returns to the second age later, as we shall see. Paragraph VI, "De iuuenibus" which "Adolescentem uocauerunt" is also treated at greater length in a later paragraph. But the fourth age, "De Vivis" corresponds to Shakspere's soldier, "Bearded like a pard." Pollux devotes almost the whole paragraph to the beard and its development in "Iuuenum" and "Uirum."

Paragraph VIII is headed "De Adolescentibus" and should, logically, have formed a part of VI. It begins,

ADolescentulus, Adulescens. Iuuencus uero licet dicatur, Comicum tamen magis est. Iuuenum uero coetus, neolaila dicitur [the lover]. Deinde Vir est, qui militarem aetatem assecutus est [Shakspere's soldier comes next after his lover], aetatem censui obnoxiam habens, uegetus, ferauens, bellicosae aetatis existens, . . .

Jealous in honour, sudden and quick in quarrel,
Seeking the bubble reputation
Even in the cannon's mouth . . .

Paragraph IX takes up early middle age, "De Mediae Aetatis: Iuuenibus." It begins, "Concionibus aptam aetatem habens." Shakspere makes him a justice. Pollux supplies words for degrees of grey hair, calls him Senex, and in Greek, Presbyter, and ends, "Nihil est uetustius, pro eo quod est, nihil est nobilius." Shakspere's justice is far more graphic and picturesque,

In fair round belly with good capon lin'd,
With eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances.

Paragraph X, "De Senibus," is uninteresting for our purpose, but XI, "De Vetystate," has some interesting parallels to Shakspere's last two ages. Pollux quotes Hyperides as saying,

In senectutis limine, in occasu uitae, ut iam balbutiat
lingua, ut uox obscura et intricata existat, ut uox erret, . . .
and his big manly voice,
Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
And whistles in his sound.
ut senectus imbecillem reddiderit ["second childishness"],
ut pedes tremant & labentur, ut sint obliqui, inconstantes, . . .
& his similia.

The old man may be described as

Senior Saturno, edentulus [sans teeth], Senex capularis, decipiens,
clamosus, desipiens, insulsus [sans taste], attritus, silicernium,
inuersus propter aeternem, immutatus ceruus, aut cornices aetate
superans aut Nymphis coetaneus, & similia [sans everything].

Pollux next devotes a paragraph to women, but paragraph XIII returns to the subject "De Formatis ab aetatibus uerbis," and runs through some further descriptions of each age. Here we find the schoolboy:

Ephebis exire, instituere, tum etiam puerascere, educatio. Et Puerilis
disciplina, apud Platonem inuenitur, . . .

Youth is characterized by rashness or hastiness.

Lysias Iuueniliter audaces nominauit, & audaces Iuuenes. Viriliter
autem agere . . . unde Viriliter, et fortiter, ut Plato dixit, unde etiam
Coetus uirilis, secundum Isaeum . . .

But when youth passes old age comes on, and we have another collection of words to describe its infirmities. Only one phrase is especially suggestive of Shakspere. Pollux includes what Gualther translates as "extendi membra.". A later translator renders the phrase "membra emarcida" which might have suggested "his shrunk shank."

Though Shakspere was a keen observer of life at first hand, it does not seem probable that independent observation would have produced so many parallels of phraseology. He follows Pollux rather than either the astrological or the medical tradition in the general characteristic of each age, since Hippocrates puts the development of the beard in the third age, Shakspere and Pollux put it in the fourth. Mexia assigns the fifth age to Mars. Shakspere and Pollux put soldiering in the fourth; Shakspere's fifth age is nearer Mexia's sixth. Hippocrates gives no descriptive details about the sixth and seventh ages. Mexia gives some, but

those of his sixth age do not correspond to Shakspere's, and Pollux has many and better parallels for the seventh age.¹⁷

Altogether there are so many more verbal parallels between Pollux and Shakspere than between any other author and the poet that, unless further evidence can be discovered, we must assume that Shakspere's was drawing, either directly or indirectly, on the *Onomasticon*. It is tempting to conjecture that the country youth, coming up to town and finding himself in competition with university men in the business of playwriting, made an effort to improve his education and his vocabulary and so became acquainted with this famous thesaurus.

Unfortunately, we cannot be sure that he did not make the acquaintance of Pollux either in the schoolroom at Stratford, or indirectly through some lost or unidentified English rhetoric or wordbook. What we can be reasonably sure of is that he was following a verbal rather than, or in addition to, a pictorial tradition, and that he was putting into Jaques' mouth, as Professor Campbell believes, not an expression of personal disillusion, but a set of rhetorical commonplaces such as a conventional malcontent of no great intellectual stature might utter.

Hunter College, New York City.

¹Oxford Press, 1943, p. 51.

²See the collections in Boswell's *Malone* ed. (1821), VI, 519-21; J. W. Jones, "Observations on the Origin of the Division of Man's Life Into Stages," *Archæologia*, XXXV (1853), 167-89; J. G. Waller, "Christian Iconography and Legendary Art: The Wheel of Human Life, or the Seven Ages," *Gentleman's Magazine*, XXXIX (1853), 494-502; John Martin (ed.), *The Seven Ages of Shakespeare* (London, 1840), an elaborate but unimportant study; Henry Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (1870), 405-10, which follows Jones and adds little; and the editions of *As You Like It* in the New Variorum Shakespeare, ed. H. H. Furness, VIII (1890), 122-24; *The Arden Shakespeare*, ed. J. W. Holme (1914); and G. L. Kittredge's edition (Boston, n.d.), p. xvii.

³"Jaques' 'Seven Ages' and Bartholomaeus Anglicus," *MLN*, LIV (1939), 273-76.

⁴"Jaques' 'Seven Ages' and Censorinus," *MLN*, LV (1940), 103-51.

⁵"Jaques' 'Seven Ages' and Pedro Mexia," *MLN*, LVI (1941), 601-3.

⁶This is an abridged translation of Mexia, but it gives the passage in question in full. It appeared in 1571 under the title, *The Forest or Collection of Histories*, and is from the French of Claude Gruget (1552) rather than from Mexia's Spanish (1543). See Bk. I, ch. 17, pp. 45-49.

⁷Sir Walter Raleigh follows Mexia in his account of the seven ages in his *History of the World*, I, 2, sec. 5; see *Works* (Oxford, 1829), II, 60.

⁸It does not appear in the extant works of Hippocrates, and is known only through the report of Philo Judaeus, in his *Liber de mundi opificio*; see *Philo*, ed. F. H. Colson and G. T. Whitaker (Loeb Classics, 1929), I, 83-87. Philo also describes Solon's ten ages.

⁹Macrobius describes an elaborate division and sub-division of man's life into periods of seven years, months, and days; see *In Somnium Scipionis*, Bk. I, ch. 6.

¹⁰Professor S. C. Chew, in a lecture at the Pierpont Morgan Library, has recently presented a very interesting collection of illustrations of pictorial representations of the ages showing every number from three to twelve.

¹¹It seems not to have been recorded in this connection that there was a tapestry of the "Seven Ages of Man" hanging in the royal palace at Greenwich about the time of Queen Mary, and no doubt still there in Shakspere's day; see E. Hasted, *Kent* (1778), I, 60, from MS. Harl. 1419, fol. 37.

¹²Edition of 1588, pp. 99-100, under "Virgo."

¹³Raleigh's *Workes*, VIII, 704-5. The lines may post-date Shakspere's, but they are in spirit and substance a summary of Palingenius.

¹⁴I am indebted to Miss Rosamond Tuve for calling my attention to this passage.

¹⁵The accounts of the seven ages in both Censorinus and Pollux were first mentioned in this connection by J. W. Jones, *op. cit.*, but not described or discussed.

¹⁶Ed. Amsterdam, 1706, pp. 153-63.

¹⁷*Notes and Queries*, III, xii, 123, notes that Florio's Montaigne has the phrases "sans tongues, sans eyes, and sans ears" in the "Apologie for Raymond Seybound." It also notes (I, xii, 7) that the psuedo-Platonic *Axiocbus* describes the successive miseries of human life. But the division is into five ages; see the facsimile reprint of the translation attributed to Spenser by F. M. Padelford (Johns Hopkins Press, 1934), pp. 46-48.

SHAKSPERE'S HEROIC SHREW
BY RAYMOND A. HOUK

(*Conclusion*)

II

Shakspere's heroine is neither to be listed in medical journals as a case of deranged physical functions nor in theological libraries as an example of a woman who was possessed of a devil; Katherine is rather to be placed in the galaxy of Shakspere's women among those who come but short of perfection.

During the course of *The Shrew* it becomes apparent that a bride should be young and beautiful, and not without an ample dowry; fair and chaste, with all the virtues of modesty and sobriety. She should be gentle, temperate, and patient, conformable in all things to her duty. She should be kind and loving, obedient, in turn, to her parents and to her husband, and not niggard in giving thanks.

She should look as clear as morning roses newly washed with dew (II.i.173-174); she should be virtuous and fair (lines 43, 92), though brown in hue as hazelnuts; straight and slender as the hazel twig; princely in gait as Dian in a grove (lines 254-263). She should not be proud-minded (line 132), but mild and pleasant, courteous and, possibly, slow in speech (lines 247-248), knowing when to be silent and when to speak with soft low tongue and lowly courtesy (Ind.i.114). The ideal wife should have a cheerful countenance, sweet as springtime flowers, never frowning or sour, with no sullen biting of the lip (II.i.229, 231, 245, 248-250) or threatening unkind brow (V.ii.136). She should, however, not be without wit and eloquence (II.i.177). Affable and merry, she should share in gamesome mood the humors of her husband (lines 247, 253). Of all titles she should avoid, the worst, such a one as 'Katherine the curst' (I.ii.129-130; II.i.187).

With this latter paragraph (largely derived from Petruccio's not wholly mocking description of Katherine in the wooing scene), with the rhyme of curst and worst, may be

compared a similar negative-and-positive description of the ideal wife in Robert Tofte's translation of Lodovico Ariosto's *Satire on Marriage*—a satire which tells how to choose and how to rule a wife:

Pure of complexion let her be and good,
And in her cheeke faire circled crimson blood.
Hie colours argue choler and distaste,
And such hot blouds are seldom made to waste.
Let her be milde and wittie, but not curst,
Nor foolish, for of all breeds that's the worst.
None so deformed are, or ugly foule,
As fooles which more are gazd at then the Owle.

Let her be pleasing, full of curtesie,
Lowly of minde, prides deadly enemie:
Pleasant of speech, seldomme sad or never,
And let her countnance cheareful be for ever,
A viniger tart looke or clowdy brow,
Furroud with wrinckles I doe not allow.
And so to pout or lowre through sullennesse,
Is a strong signe of dogged peeviousnesse. (p. 57)³⁴

Shakspeare's ideal of womanhood obviously was his in common with those of other men. He was, however, probably too much of a realist, and a humorist, to believe implicitly in his own idealizations, for, before the play is over, he permits even the model Bianca to exhibit some of the qualities of a shrew.

The difference between Katherine and other women of better reputation, accordingly, may be regarded as merly one of degree. In *The Defence of Good Women* Sir Thomas Elyot declares that Aristotle says, "that a woman is a worke of nature unperfecte. And more over, that her propertie is to delyte in rebukyng, and to be alway complayning, and never contented."³⁵ Althought such a characterization may be unfair to women in general, it would seem to fit Shakspeare's shrew well enough. In *A Shrew*, II.i.5, Valeria refers to "Kate" as one "whom nought can please."

There are many indications in *The Shrew* that Katherine may have been accustomed to have her lugubrious moments (cf. II.i.286; IV.i.146, 152). After a stormy and futile scene Katherine bids her father,

Talk not to me! I will go sit and weep
Till I can find occasion of revenge. (II.i.35-36)

Petruchio presently prepares himself to meet and woo a Katherine who may "rail" and "frown" or who may be "mute and will not speak a word" (lines 170-175).

When, shamed by the non-appearance of the bridegroom on the day appointed for her marriage, Katherine, after a brave speech (III.ii.8-20, 26), exits "weeping," she would seem to have just cause, as noted above; yet Baptista's words, "I cannot blame thee now to weep" (line 27), would seem to imply that she may have been wont to weep without rhyme or reason.

Later, when tamed, Katherine addresses the "froward wives" in words once applicable to herself:

Fie, fie! unknit that threatening unkind brow,
And dart not scornful glances from those eyes
To wound thy lord, thy king, thy governor!
It blots thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads,
Confounds thy fame as whirlwinds shake fair buds,
And in no sense is meet or amiable.
A woman mov'd is like a fountain troubled,
Muddy, ill-seeming, thick, bereft of beauty;
And while it is so, none so dry or thirsty
Will deign to sip or touch one drop of it. (V.ii.136-145)

These lines may be thought, in part, indicative of choler, but the "fountain troubled" and the "frosts" which bite the meads would seem more suggestive of melancholy.⁴¹ Although Katherine is often moved to anger, she is also frequently moved to tears.

Aristotle, as quoted by Elyot, may well have had a shrew in mind when he stated that a woman's "propertie is to delyte in rebukyng, and to be always complayning, and never contented." With such a conception Shakspere's heroine, as a typical shrew, is in entire accord.

Probably no one in sixteenth-century England needed to be told what a curst shrew was, but many a man may have wished he knew how to tame his. That Shakspere himself believed in the efficacy of Petruchio's method is to be doubted; he concludes *The Shrew* with a remark by Lucentio, " 'Tis a wonder, by your leave, she will be tam'd so."

1. Lucentio, however, would probably have been sur-

prised had he been told that Katherine had been "reduced to marital compatibility" by a "physical therapy." Thus has Mr. Draper reaffirmed his thesis of "Kate the Curst" by the statements, here quoted in full, that "Kate is reduced to marital compatibility by damp and cold and starvation," and that Shakspere in *The Shrew* "cures the disease of choler in a few scenes by the recognized physical therapy, which is forced upon the patient."⁴²

(1) Although Petruchio makes some use of "starvation," it is more than doubtful whether "damp and cold" play, or are supposed to play, a part in the taming of the shrew.⁴³ The word 'damp' does not occur in *The Shrew*.

It is true, the time is obviously winter, the weather cold, and fire required (IV.i.4, 17, 21, 41; V.ii.102); but, except for some choice clowning by Grumio the fool, no use is made in *The Shrew* of the idea of cold.

To Curtis' question, "Is she so hot a shrew as she's reported?" (IV.i.22), Grumio replies proverbially,

She was, good Curtis, before this frost, but thou know'st winter tames man, woman, and beast; for it hath tam'd my old master, and my new mistress, and myself, fellow Curtis. (lines 23-26)

The latter, it may be observed (lines 27-28), seems to regard Grumio's statement as having been made for no purpose other than to call him a beast.⁴⁴

Grumio is accustomed to speak with humorous exaggeration. He calls himself "a piece of ice" and declares that his "master and mistress are almost frozen to "death" (lines 14, 40).⁴⁵ Yet when Petruchio and Katherine actually appear there is no reference made either to cold or to any need of heat.

Such an effect of frost upon "man, woman, and beast" was more humorously than literally alleged. Moreover, winter's taming of all living creatures subject to its cold would be something other than the taming of a shrew. Neither Grumio, Petruchio, nor Katherine has actually been tamed; Grumio explicitly warns Curtis lest he feel their mistress' hand (line 32). But Grumio's words are as unnecessary as irrelevant, for, as Curtis finally permits himself to declare, "There's fire ready" (line 41; cf. lines 55, 97-98, 117-118).⁴⁶

There is no evidence in *The Shrew* that Katherine suffers cold at any other time than, possibly, during the horseback ride on the afternoon of her wedding day. Accordingly, when Hortensio on Thursday asks her,⁴⁷ "Mistress, what cheer?" and she replies, "Faith, as cold as can be" (IV.iii.37), neither of them, apparently, is referring to the temperature of the air or of her body.⁴⁸ Petruchio exhorts her, "Pluck up thy spirits; look cheerfully upon me" (line 38). Fasting from Sunday morning (or Saturday evening) to the following Thursday, together with loss of sleep, would seem to be sufficient to account for Katherine's depressed spirits. Grumio's statement on her wedding day that winter "hath tam'd my old master, and my new mistress, and myself" (IV.i.24-25), is a fool's jest which should fool no one.

There is, accordingly, no evidence in *The Shrew* to support Mr. Draper's assertion that "the cold and mud of the journey counteract her hot, dry humor, and start the cure" of Katherine the curst.⁴⁹

(2) Mr. Draper's other assertion that, in the country, "the severe regimen of cold and hunger and watching tempers her choleric spirit until she learns to 'entreat,'"⁵⁰ is not, however, so obviously in error. Deleted of the word 'cold' and made to read, "the severe regimen of hunger and watching brings Katherine to a realization of her folly in having refused to give thanks for services rendered her," it would seem to be a fairly correct description of the course of events.

Somewhat beside the point, Mr. Draper cites Galen in support of the notion that "much eting is also dangerous to this [choleric] humor," and asserts that Petruchio "sees to it that she shall have little food."⁵¹

Enforced fasting or starvation does play an important part in the taming of the shrew, but the "starvation" involves more than a mere reduction in the amount of food allowed Katherine; it would seem to be, while it lasts, total. The first food which is given to her after her marriage on Sunday is that in the scene of IV.iii.36-52 (which must be dated Thursday). The question becomes, accordingly, not whether a reduced diet would be beneficial to one supposed to have

a choleric humor, but whether a four days' fast would have been prescribed by Shakspere's medical contemporaries as a cure for choler.

Sir Thomas Elyot is on record as having declared that, "to a choleryke person, it is right dangerous, to use long abstinence."⁵² Andrew Boorde likewise declared, "Colorycke men should not be longe fastynge."⁵³ These two, at least, would hardly have thought that the fasting ordeal, to which Petruchio subjects Katherine, would cure choleric humor.

Although, after her bootless attempt to avoid being behold-
ing to Petruchio for her meat (IV.iii.1-35), Katherine is
permitted to eat on Thursday, her taming has not yet been
affected; she merely meets one of Petruchio's conditions,
that of giving thanks (lines 41-47). That she has not fully
subdued herself to her husband, is vividly brought out in the
subsequent episodes of the cap and the gown, and in the
dispute concerning the time of day.

It would seem, accordingly, that Petruchio does not tame
his wife by means of any "physical therapy."

2. The taming of the shrew is a process to which many
things contribute. Properly understood in the traditional
sense, it is something other than a rectification of bodily
disorders; it involves a change in Katherine's way of
thinking.

An early clew as to Petruchio's method is provided by the
jesting Grumio. Says he, "O' my word, an she knew him as
well as I do, she would think scolding would do little good
upon him" (I.ii.108-110). Scolding would seem to be a
device employed by Katherine to gain her own way;⁵⁴ there
are obviously others in her bag of tricks, but Petruchio is
to be moved by none of them; he presently informs Baptista:

I am as peremptory as she proud-minded;
And where two raging fires meet together,
They do consume the thing that feeds their fury.
Though little fire grows great with little wind,
Yet extreme gusts will blow out fire and all.
So I to her, and so she yields to me,
For I am rough and woo not like a babe. (II.i.132-138)⁵⁵

Despite these physical images (which have original reference to his wooing), Petruchio does not, even after his marriage, lay a violent hand upon Katherine. He and she seem to recognize the fact that no gentleman would strike a lady (II.i.220-223). Directing his oaths and blows at his hapless servants, Petruchio anticipates Katherine in every imminent outburst of violence and abusive words, so that the latter presently finds herself, in a role new to her, interceding in behalf of the servants and urging her husband to patience.

Grumio, having already spoken of the "foul ways" (IV.i.2), says, not without possible exaggeration, to Curtis:

Tell thou the tale But hadst thou not cross'd me, thou shouldst have heard how her horse fell, and she under her horse; thou shouldst have heard in how miry a place, how she was bemoil'd, how he left her with the horse upon her, how he beat me because her horse stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him off me; how he swore, how she pray'd that never pray'd before; (lines 74-81)

"Patience, I pray you. 'Twas a fault unwilling" (line 159), urges Katherine when Petruchio strikes another servant. "I pray you, husband, be not so disquiet" (line 171), she implores him after he may have thrown the meat at the servants.

Similar to Petruchio's rôle of a "grumbling groom" (III.ii.155; IV.i.191-192) is the simulated wrath of "the Father" who could "act any Part, as well as any Comedian," in Eulalia's tale to Xantippe of "a Gentleman of a noble Family" who married a young Lady, a Virgin of seventeen Years of Age," in Desiderius Erasmus' colloquy "The Uneasy Wife" (translated in 1557 as *A mery dialogue declaringe the propertyes of shrowde shrewes and honest wyves*).⁵⁶ As Petruchio is neither to be satisfied with a railing scold nor with a sullen peevish wife, so Erasmus' hero, who wanted "an agreeable Companion," not "one that was always a crying, and fretting herself," thought to form his wife's "Manners to his own Humour."⁵⁷ As Erasmus' hero, whom Eulalia calls "the best natur'd Man in the World" (and whom modern historians would identify with Sir Thomas More),⁵⁸ is reluctant to follow the suggestion of his "Father-in-Law" that he "cudgel" his "disobedient" wife "into a due

Submission," so Petruchio also prefers the use of "Art or Authority" to persuade Katherine to submit to his will.

Katherine, as the "young lady" of Eulalia's tale (whose original may have been More's first wife, Jane Colt), who formerly "neither knew" her husband nor herself, is to become "another Sort of Person," henceforth "mindful of her Duty."⁵⁹

Eulalia's young lady is an example of a petulant bride who had to be taught obedience to the rule of her husband. Xantippe, the uneasy wife of Erasmus' merry dialogue, illustrates the more violent aspects of Katherine's conduct.⁶⁰

In *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin* the unnamed husband beats Jone with birch rods until she swoons, and then binds her, naked and bloody, in a salted raw horsehide until she has a change of heart.⁶¹

Ariosto, in his Satire on Marriage, offers advice to a lord. After he has told the "thrice noble Hanibal," according to Robert Tofte's version, "how a wife to chuse," Ariosto gives him further directions:

But now since I have taught thee how to get,
Thy best of choice, and thee on horse-backe set.
Ile learne thee how to ride her: wild or tame,
To curb her when, and when to raine the same: (p. 62)

Tofte has interpolated the phrase, "wild or tame." The Italian runs:

Poi ch'io t'ho posto assai ben a cavallo
Ti voglio pur mostrar come lo guidi,
Come spinger lo dei, come fermallo. (379a)⁶²

In *The Shrew*, II.i.278-280, Petruchio declares to Katherine: For I am he am born to tame you, Kate,
And bring you from a wild Kate to a Kate
Conformable as other household Kates.

Ariosto continues with the figure of a horse:

Meglio con la man dolce si raffena,
Che con forza il cavallo: e meglio i cani
Le lusinghe fan tuoi, che la catena. (379a)

This Tofte renders as:

A gentle hand, A Colt doth sooner tame
Then chaines or fetters which do make him lame. (p. 62)⁶³

On the superiority of a gentle hand over chains or fetters Shakspere is in agreement with Erasmus and Ariosto as against the author of *The Wife Lapped in Morels Skin*.

Instead of a horse or a colt, however, Shakspere uses the figure of training a falcon:

My falcon now is sharp, and passing empty,
And till she stoop she must not be full-gorg'd,
For then she never looks upon her lure.
Another way I have to man my haggard,
To make her come, and know her keeper's call:
That is, to watch her, as we watch these kites
That bate and beat and will not be obedient. (IV.i.193-199)

Obedience seems to have been the chief thing a sixteenth-century husband demanded of a wife.

Katherine, although not yet minded to show obedience to her husband, seems to have shown some recognition of the virtue of patience; but Petruchio remains dissatisfied with her failure to "give thanks" before meat (IV.i.161-163); he continues the taming process with the requirement that she shall voice thanks for services rendered her (IV.iii.39-43); then he requires that she shall cease to contradict him, no matter how wrong he obviously is; finally he requires that she shall enter with full abandon into his mood. Nothing less than a complete revolution in her way of thinking is Petruchio's demand.

Although Katherine apparently has made some sort of submission to Petruchio before they take to the road on Thursday afternoon to journey to Padua, she does not fully see the light until, as it were on the road to Damascus, she has a sudden burst of understanding, and decides to play Petruchio's game:

Forward, I pray, since we have come so far,
And be it moon, or sun, or what you please.
And if you please to call it a rush candle,
Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me. (IV.v.12-15)

The measures which Petruchio had previously taken, such as depriving her of meat and sleep, and of a new cap and gown, may have shown her the folly of refusing to fall in with his humor. Petruchio had given no sufficient reason for dragging her home before the wedding dinner (III.ii.

186-194); he gave a reason by no means valid for depriving her of supper on Sunday evening; what reasons he may have given her for keeping her fasting from Sunday to Thursday are not fully stated; his reasons for rejecting the new cap and gown were nonsensical (IV.iii.59-170); his statement on Thursday afternoon that it was "some seven o'clock" in the morning (IV.iii.189-190) was so palpably wrong that, had Katherine then had an active sense of humor, she would hardly have bothered to correct him; however, when, somewhat later in the day, Petruchio calls the sun a moon (IV.v.2), she understands, though a little belatedly, that he is but being humorous. Possibly Katherine's metamorphosis (so called in *The Taming of a Shrew*, V.i.88) consists in gaining a saving sense of humor, as well as in yielding the mastery to her husband. Her words to Vincentio would seem to have something of a humorous cast (IV.v.37-41,45-49).

Although tamed, her spirit remains unbroken. Katherine has subdued her mind, heart, and reason to her husband (V.ii.170-171), yet much to Petruchio's delight, she retains her full vigor, as of old, to be employed with obvious relish against the headstrong women (lines 20-35, 136-179).

It may, accordingly, be concluded that the heroine of *The Taming of the Shrew* is not to be described as the victim of a choleric humor, nor is the taming process to which she is subjected to be called a cure for choleric humor; she is neither to be thought of as sexually thwarted nor as possessed of a devil. Katherine, once a wailing woman and a common scold, is so changed in the latter scenes of the play that Petruchio foresees for himself "peace" and "love, and quiet life," and, "to be short, what not that's sweet and happy" (V.ii.107-110). An understanding wife, responsive to her husband's will and ready to "do him ease" (line 179), Katherine is superior to Bianca, and inferior to none of Shakspere's heroines.

Washington, D. C.

³⁹This quotation from Ariosto's *Satires* (London, 1608), with its mention of "choler" and "hot blouds," would possibly have more significance for the problem of Shakspere's use of medical terms in *The Shrew* if it could be demonstrated that Tofte had made his free and annotated translation in time for its use in the original shrew play. Tofte's manuscript had been in other hands for some time before its publication, as he indicates by his statement that it had been printed without his "consent or knowledge, in another man's name" (*The Blazon of Jealousie*, London, 1615, p. 6, 28, 63). It is definitely known that Tofte was making translations from Ariosto in

1592, for the first of his *Two Tales. Translated out of Ariosto* (London, 1597), is dated "Siena 28. di Lulio 1592." Toft was in Italy "between March, 1591, and June, 1594." (Franklin B. Williams, Jr., "Robert Toft," *RES*, XIII [1937], 287). Had Toft forwarded his manuscript of *Ariosto's Satyres* to England in time for its use in the original shrew play and in *The Shrew*, the fact would serve to explain how the manuscript had come into other hands and was published without his knowledge.

Besides the quotation given above, there are also other parallels between *Ariosto's Satyres* and *The Shrew* and *A Shrew*, both individually and in common. The relationship indicated would seem to be an influence from *Ariosto's Satyres* first upon the common source of *A Shrew* and *The Shrew* and then upon *The Shrew* alone, much as Ariosto's *I Suppositi* was first used for the earlier form of the play and then used by Shakspere when he rewrote it as *The Shrew*.

⁴⁰E. J. Howard (Oxford, Ohio, 1940), p. 26. It may be of some significance for Katherine's telling the headstrong women "What duty they do owe their lord and husbands" (V.ii.130-179), that Elyot's Zenobia sets forth in Aristotelian terms, derived from her "studye in moral philosophy," the "duety" of women to their husbands (*ibid.*, pp. 55-57). There are other indications that *The Defence of Good Women* may have influenced *The Shrew* in its original form.

⁴¹See note 55 below.

⁴²"Benedick and Beatrice," *JEGP*, XLI (1942), 140.

⁴³Mr. Draper's declaration (*JNMD*, *op. cit.*, p. 760) that Shakspere in *The Shrew* "adds to his source [by which he means *A Shrew*] a description of the journey after the wedding with its detail of the cold inclement season, for this was doubtless intended to play its part in the curing of Kate's choler," is misleading. In *A Shrew* also the time is supposed to be winter, fire is provided in Ferando's chamber (III.i.35-36), and mention is made of "the winter rage" (III.v.59).

⁴⁴A hint for such name calling was probably found in Ariosto (*Supposes*, III.i. 19-21).

⁴⁵Taking Grumio literally, Mr. Draper reads his own ideas into the text of *The Shrew*, when he declares that "Petruchio took care to expose his wife to mud and mire and cold," etc. (*op. cit.*, p. 760). The word 'mud' does not occur in *The Shrew*.

⁴⁶Mr. Draper, who refers to "a cheerless house in which apparently the servants have not yet made the fire" (*op. cit.*, p. 760), seems to have overlooked Curtis' statement.

⁴⁷See note 15 above.

⁴⁸This is in opposition to Mr. Draper, who also erroneously dates the scene of IV.iii.1-58 on the day after the wedding (*op. cit.*, p. 760).

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 761.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 761-762.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, p. 760.

⁵²*The Castel of Helth* (London, 1541), p. 71 *verso*, facsimile, New York, 1936. Elyot, citing "Hipocrates" and "the opynion of best lerned men," as well as his "own peynful experiance," supports his declaration with divers reasons.

⁵³*A compendious Reggiment or a dyetary of Helth* (London, 1542), F. J. Furnivall, *EETS*, Ex. Ser. No. 10, p. 288, London, 1870.

⁵⁴Cf. Draper, *op. cit.*, p. 758.

⁵⁵Mr. Draper asserts: "Petruchio more auspiciously compares his humor and hers to 'two raging fires' that will the more quickly burn each other out" (*op. cit.*, p. 759). This would seem to be an improper use of the figure of the "two raging fires" (II.i.133) to build up a case for a choleric humor.

⁵⁶First edition in 1523. Cf. *The Colloquies of Erasmus*, tr. by Nicholas Bailey (ed. 1878, London), I, 249-251. *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera omnia* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1703-1706), I, 702-707. The unique copy of the 1557 translation of "The Uneasy Wife" (London) is in the British Museum. The tale of the "Gentleman" and the "young Lady" was omitted from the translation of the "Dialogue betweene a good Woman and a Shrew" in William Burton's *Seven Dialogues both pitiable and profitable* (London, 1606).

⁵⁷Bailey, I, 250.

⁵⁸Bailey, I, 251. Cf. P. S. Allen, "More and Netherhall," *LTSS* (Dec. 26, 1918), p. 654; Preserved Smith, *A Key to the Colloquies of Erasmus* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 15. More's second wife, the widow Alice Middleton, is also said to have been something of a shrew.

⁵⁹Bailey, I, 251.

⁶⁰Other parallels with *The Shrew* would seem to support a suggestion that Shakspeare may have used "The Uneasy Wife" and others of Erasmus' colloquies. Cf. "The Integrity of Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*," *JEGP*, XXXIV (1940), 225.

⁶¹See note 28 above, and pp. 82-88.

⁶²See note 39 above. This is "Satira Quinta" in *Opere di M. Lodovico Ariosto* (Venezia, 1730), II, 377-379. Numerous editions of *Le Satire* appeared after Ariosto's death in 1533.

⁶³It may be only a coincidence that Sir Thomas More's first wife, whom he is said to have taught obedience, was a Colt.

POLONIUS'S ADVICE TO LAERTES

BY N. B. ALLEN

THE question of how we should interpret Polonius's advice to Laertes in *Hamlet*, I, 3, has been the source of much difference of opinion. The difficulty arises from the fact that the advice is wise and well phrased, while the speaker of it, Polonius, is elsewhere a foolish old man.¹

As Professor Schücking has pointed out², attempts to harmonize the speech with Polonius's character take two forms. Some critics try to raise the character of Polonius to the level of the speech, others to lower the speech to the level of Polonius. The first group supposes that Polonius has not always been a fool—if he had been, they say, Claudius would not respect him as he does.³ Therefore, when he can depend upon his stored-up knowledge, they declare, he sounds like a wise man; otherwise he reveals that he is a simpleton.⁴ The second group argues that the speech is not really wise at all, that it is a trite collection of so-called wisdom which only a vulgarian could admire. By parading such trivialities, they insist, Polonius increases our contempt for him.⁵

The weakness of the first argument—that this is stored-up wisdom—is that Polonius does not elsewhere reveal this ability to memorize and repeat. It is true that he often boasts of the lessons he has learned from life—as in his warning to Ophelia earlier in the same scene and in his explanation to the Queen of the reason for Hamlet's madness (II, 2), but in these cases his wisdom is clownish and lamely expressed, not well integrated and epigrammatic as in the passage in question.

The second argument—that the speech is contemptible—is an obvious rationalization. Nearly all modern readers do admire Polonius's advice, and its similarity to passages in Lyly's *Euphues* and Lodge's *A Margarite of America*, both of which were then popular, indicates that the attitude of the Elizabethans was the same.

But when it is concluded that the passage is in fact out of character, the problem still remains: Why did Shakspere

put it into the play? Schücking has given no answer to this question.

It seems possible that Shakspere was here using a passage not originally intended for *Hamlet*. The following arguments can be advanced in support of this possibility:

1. Polonius makes no specific reference to Laertes or his journey to France except in the two lines:

And they in France of the best rank and station
Are of a most select and generous chief in that.

And these lines are easily separable from the rest. Indeed, the typesetter of *Q₁* seems to have realized that they should be so separated, for he omitted from them the quotation marks by which he indicated the gnomic quality of the rest of the speech.⁷

2. When read in connection with the preceding and following lines, the passage shows evidence of having been inserted. Polonius tells Laertes to hasten and then delays him with this long advice. Of course, it may be argued that Shakspere was trying by this means to make Polonius ridiculous,⁸ but if he had been would he not have made the passage ridiculous as well? Did Shakspere expect the audience to have the perspicacity to laugh at Polonius for giving advice at the same time that they revered the advice he gave? In this connection it should be noted that if the passage is deleted from the text, the continuity of the speeches which remain is excellent.

3. As has been often shown, Shakspere has elsewhere made insertions in his plays, insertions which in two cases are clearly indicated by the mislining of the blank verse. This mislining apparently resulted when the passages were added in the margins of the manuscripts. The passages are "The lunatic, the lover, and the poet" speech of Theseus in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, V, 1,⁹ and Mercutio's "Queen Mab" speech in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, 4.¹⁰ The second of these passages is no more in keeping with Mercutio's character than is the advice to Laertes with that of Polonius. During most of the play Mercutio burlesques romantic

ideas in bawdy terms. Here he speaks with fragile daintiness. It is true that both Mercutio's and Polonius's speeches may be made fairly convincing when spoken by an actor on the stage—Shakspere would not have put them into the plays if this were not possible—but the inconsistencies are there, for all that.

Critics who believe in the complete unity of Shakspere's text should remember before they show too much zeal in its defense that to make an insertion in a play was not extraordinary in Shakspere's time. According to a large body of critical opinion, Ben Jonson made insertions in Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, and Middleton did the same thing in Shakspere's *Macbeth*; and in neither case is the added material altogether in keeping with the rest. That Shakspere was acquainted with the practice is shown by his representing Hamlet as making an insertion "of some dozen or sixteen lines" in *The Murder of Gonzago*, as well as by the textual evidence of the two passages in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Romeo and Juliet* cited above.

But this merely proves that the passage *may* have been inserted. The strongest evidence is, after all, the lack of harmony between the speech and the character. The character of Polonius is comparable to a cathedral part of which is built in an architectural style different from the rest—like Chartres or St. John the Divine. The natural supposition of those who see one of these cathedrals is that the inharmonious part was built earlier or later than the rest. And yet neither in the character nor in the cathedral is beauty destroyed.¹¹

¹¹L. L. Schücking, in *Character Problems in Shakespeare's Plays* (New York, 1922), pp. 102-103, has shown that Polonius is, during nearly all the play, little better than what Hamlet calls him, a "tedious old fool."

²*Ibid.*, pp. 105-109.

³Schücking cites Richard Loening (*Die Hamlet-Tragödie Shakspere* [Stuttgart, 1893], pp. 298-319) as an example of this type of critic. Loening insists that there are no real contradictions in Shakspere's handling of Polonius. He says (p. 299): "Der Dichter hat . . . hier einen völlig einheitlichen und harmonischen Charakter geschaffen."

⁴In *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahr*, Goethe makes the actor who is to take the part of Polonius say (Book V, Chapter 6): "Ich will reden wie ein Buch wenn ich mich vorbereitet habe, und wie ein Thor, wenn ich bei guter Laune bin."

⁵Joseph Quincy Adams, in his commentary to his edition of *Hamlet*, (Cambridge, 1929) p. 206, says of Polonius's advice to Laertes: "His fondness for trite wisdom gets the better of him. . . . It is, indeed, amusing how the intellectually middle class like tags of wordly wisdom or platitudinous sentiment."

⁶William Lowes Rushton, in *Shakespeare's Euphuism* (London, 1871), pp. 44-47, tries to show that Shakspere's passage was imitated from *Euphues*; and Frederick Brie, in the *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* (XLII, 1906), pp. 209-211, claims that Lodge's work was the source.

⁷In this lack of reference to the situation, Polonius's speech is different from many of Shakspere's gnomic passages. Prospero, for instance, in his speech about the transitory nature of life (*The Tempest*, IV, 1, 148-158) refers twice to the pageant of spirits which aroused him to philosophize.

⁸Loening (*Ibid.*) and J. Q. Adams (*Ibid.*) make this claim.

⁹The blank verse of this passage was mislined in Q₁. See the note by J. D. Wilson to the Cambridge edition (Cambridge, 1924), and my note in *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (April, 1938), pp. 121-122.

¹⁰This passage was printed as prose in Q₁ of *Romeo and Juliet*. See J. Dover Wilson and A. W. Pollard, "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakesperian Texts. 'Romeo and Juliet, 1597,'" *Times Literary Supplement*, (August 15, 1919), p. 434.

¹¹A like suggestion is made in relation to Hamlet's third soliloquy in an article by me in *The Shakespeare Association Bulletin* (October, 1938). See pp. 201-207.

Editorial Comment

WAS SHAKSPERE A BOTCHER?

By S. A. T.

Dr. Allen's essay on Polonius's advice to the departing Laertes, published in this issue of the BULLETIN, is deserving of especial attention, not only because of its logic and persuasiveness but also because of its implications. If Dr. Allen is right in thinking that Polonius's advice is sound, logical and sensible, and therefore not fitting such a foolish person as Polonius is portrayed to be, then we must assume either that Shakspere, being an incompetent artist, bungled his delineation of the loquacious old councillor, making him an inconsistent personality, or, being an unconscionable artist, foisted into the play a speech which he happened to have in his notebook and which he was loath to leave unused.

Undoubtedly writers do insert lines and even paragraphs and whole sections and pages of material into their compositions, be these poems, plays or novels, but they do not insert matter that is irrelevant or not in harmony, or even in actual disharmony, with what precedes or follows. Furthermore, when an artist, be he poet, dramatist or novelist, makes such an insertion, he knows how to link it to the rest of the work in such a manner as to avoid detection. He not only knows how to do so but he does it. The fact that Polonius's speech (*Hamlet*, I, iii, 57-80, in Furness's edition) can be omitted without spoiling the continuity of the speeches proves nothing. Many speeches—and even whole scenes—can be deleted from Shakspere's (and others' plays) without leaving a noticeable gap or giving an impression of patchiness. Dr. Allen's statement that it "has been often shown" that "Shakspere has elsewhere made insertions in his plays" is an erroneous over-statement; this has not been shown to have been the case

even in the two instances he cites (Theseus's and Mercutio's speeches); it has only been asserted or claimed, not shown. Mislining of speeches, the basis for the assertion, may result from other causes than marginal additions; besides, the Polonius speech is not mislined.

Even if we assume that the speech is too wise for Polonius, it does not follow that the speech was not originally intended for him. Shakspere is frequently inconsistent in his character delineations; note, for example King Lear, Macbeth and his Lady, Cloten, and even Hamlet,—hence the interminable discussions regarding them. What persons in real life are not sometimes inconsistent? Sensible persons often say and do foolish things, and foolish persons sometimes speak and act sensibly. Polonius speaks wisely, very wisely, when he says "We are oft to blame in this, that with devotion's visage and pious action we do sugar o'er the devil himself." Wise old man! Why should a person in a play always be consistent? After all, Shakspere was only telling a story, not writing character sketches; if the story at some point required or suggested a certain action or speech, he had no hesitation in introducing it, even though it might seem out of character or improbable. (Note, for example, the utterly preposterous scene in *Othello* [Act IV, i, 104-179] in which the Moor is eavesdropping on the conversation between Iago and Cassio.) He is downright contemptible when, for the sake of a smutty joke, he makes Cleopatra ask a cringing messenger for "what good turn" Antony and Octavius have become such good friends. A son leaving home suggests a bit of paternal advice, as we see in the Countess's farewell to

her son in *All's Well* (written about the same time when *Hamlet* was written); Shakspere's mind was not wholly free from the law of the Association of Ideas.

But, after all, the important question is whether Polonius's speech is out of character. Is it a collection of wise and well-phrased maxims put into the mouth of a foolish person? We propose to show that it is not, that there is really little in the old man's advice worthy of serious consideration.

'Give thy thoughts no tongue,' he says; in other words, never say what you think. A fine world this would be if we all followed that advice, or if all of us spoke only what we pretended to think. 'Give no unproportioned thought his act' would make good sense if the word 'unproportioned' meant 'impulsive'; if it means 'improper,' as Schmidt defines it, it is childish and appropriate only if the father knows his son to be irresponsible or foolish. Kittredge's gloss, 'unsymmetrical, out of harmony with reason and good conduct, does not make it any wiser. 'Be thou familiar but by no means vulgar' is trite even for old Polonius. This is also true of what he says about new friends. It requires no extraordinary wisdom to caution a young man not to rush into a quarrel and to make his opponent 'be ware of him' (surely not 'beware of him'), i.e., to give a good account of himself, if he is drawn into a quarrel. "Give everyman thine ear, but few thy voice" repeats 'Give thy thoughts no tongue.' (Kittredge's definition of 'voice' as 'suffrage, recommendation, approval' is hardly wise.) Nor is one entitled to a place in the catalogue of the particularly wise for instructing his son not to spend too much on his clothes.

'Neither a borrower nor a lender be; for loan oft loses both itself and friend' is as selfish as it is foolish. Shakspere himself, we know, was a lender. Every person sometimes has to borrow; most

business men depend upon the ability to borrow in their business ventures. Would any decent person refuse to lend money to a friend in need because a loan oft loses itself and friend? Just what would Polonius expect Laertes to do if he were asked for a loan by one of those friends whose 'adoption' he had tried and whom he had grappled to his soul 'with hoops of steel'? And certainly the generalization that 'borrowing dulls the edge of husbandry' is, to say the least, not universally applicable.

The high esteem in which Polonius's speech is generally held depends, in all likelihood, on the concluding lines: 'to thine own self be true, . . . thou canst not then be false to any man.' Kittredge says (in his edition of *Hamlet*, p. 155) that this precept 'raises the whole speech to a high ethical standard' and calls it (p. 157) 'one great general truth which includes and ennobles' all the rest. But it is noteworthy that not a single commentator has paraphrased or interpreted the words. Good reason why. The words have a fine sound but their meaning is obscure. When is a person true to himself? Is it when he is actuated by his selfish interests? If so, it expresses a vicious and damnable doctrine. Is the German true to himself when he seeks to destroy everything that does not contribute to the enslavement of all but himself? Or is a person true to himself when he acts in accordance with his training and his habits, even though these have made him a profiteer, a racketeer, a gangster? Did Polonius anticipate Spencer's doctrine that the greatest egoism is the greatest altruism? We doubt that either Polonius or Shakspere thought that.

Summing it all up, Polonius's percepts of wordly wisdom are the half-foolish utterances of a 'practical,' garulous, selfish old politician, perfectly in harmony with his character.

